

Truth's Triumph

OVER

DECEIT:

OR

A Further DEMONSTRATION
that the people called *Quakers* be Deceivers,
and such as people ought to accompt accursed in
their Doctrines and Principles.

In VINDICATION of

A Former Proof of that Charge, made good against
them ~~for~~ the sorry shifts and evasions from it, and
cavils of *George Whitehead* against it, in a pamphlet of
his, called, *The Quakers no Deceivers*.

Written by John Horne, Teacher at Lin-Alhallowes.

As a further Preservation of people from following any of their per-
nitious principles, but that they might inquire after, and more ad-
hear to the truth of the Gospel, as delivered in the writings of the
Prophets and Apostles in the Holy Scriptures.

*They have made lies their refuge, and under falsehood have they hid them-
selves, but the bail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall
over flow the hiding place. Isa. 28. 15, 17.*

*But this I know, that the Lord is with me, because mine enemy doth not try-
umph over me. Psalm. 41. 11.*

Also Queries and Answers with R. Hubbert Horne.

LONDON.

Printed for J. Allen at the Rising-Sun in St. Paul's
Church-yard. 1660.

Truth's Triumph

DECEIT:

A FORMER DEMONSTRATION

is the people called Quakers, who have
and such as they could to become a unit in
this doctrine and mission.

In View of the



A former proof of the
truth of the love and various points and
evils of the Quakers is in a pamphlet of
this call of the Quakers to the world.

Written by John James, London, in 1840.

As a further proof of the
truth of the love and various points and
evils of the Quakers is in a pamphlet of
this call of the Quakers to the world.

As a further proof of the
truth of the love and various points and
evils of the Quakers is in a pamphlet of
this call of the Quakers to the world.

LONDON.

Printed for J. Allen at the Printing-Shop in St. Paul's
Church-yard, 1840.

Truth's Triumph over deceit.

George Whitehead hath made another scribble, in pretended answer to my book intituled, *The Quakers proved Deceivers, &c.* In which he doth but more manifest his folly and fullhood, as the more he scribbles, the more it will yet appear, to such as are not blinded with ignorance or error. I shall, God assisting, shew the reader briefly what pitifull stuff he hath, in some brief observations.

That in his title he calls my charge unjust, and my book a pamphlet, and the people I preach to, *Mooreans, or Universalists*, are but some overflowings of the Gall of bitterness that he is possesst with, as also his calling my relation, a pretended and imperfect relation, and saying, that I falsely boast that I made good the charge, and of a pretended victory where I had none, which I leave to the judgement of the Lord, and of the auditory that heard our discourse, though for the perfection and truth of my relation, *George's* inability to correct or contradict it in any thing of moment, in what he hath wrote against it, may passe with sober men that hard us not, for a pretty good proof, or demonstration. And as for his charging me with false doctrine, lyings, slanders, and perverting of the truth, I may give him leave in such termes to vent his passion and never envie him for it, seeing God hath put him to rebuke before me, and the truth, notwithstanding his serpent-like winding about to hide his deceits before his deluded followers tryumps over and against his errors.

His preamble begins with truths wrongly applyed by him to his deceits: *the Serpent and his subtilty which appears against the seed of God, and against the power and wisdom of God* is manifest in him and his party, and the torment and vexation which the striving against the truth brings, and the confusion and darknesse that overwelmes them that so do is evident enough to them that can see in this envious and imbittered people, who hiss, like Serpents out of their holes, when the truth disturbs them, and laies them open. How empty & foolish a vapour it is that he saies, *the Lord was with him, and by his strength they were made able to tread upon their enemies*. All that were at the dispute (and remember how pitifully he was confounded, so that he would needs, for want of any reasonable answer, have left the argument, and fallen to read on our book, to begin some charge against us, instead of defending himself against my charge) may

easily discern. I blesse the Lord, I was in my spirit clearly above his deceits, and my mouth was enlarged over him; and the people generally received satisfaction against him. His charging me with rage and madnesse against the truth, because I was courageous for it, against his deceits, and was so far from raging, that I rejoiced against him, nothing moves me. I looke for an hundred worse things from Satan than such an aspersion.

But whereas he saith, he several times sent to me, to come forth in publick before he could get me; take the truth of the thing, that thou maist (Reader) see his deceit herein. When *George Fox* challenged me to make good my charge, he bad me appoint time and place; I appointed mine own house, or *Mr. Johnsons*, against which he excepted not, but only that time he said he could not. Therefore when *George Whitehead* sent to me to meet him, to do it either in the Market place or Steeple-house, or Steeple-house-yard, or streets, I returned him answer, what *George Fox* and I had agreed on, as to that matter; and yet, that if they would procure the steeple-house, I would meet him there: this he refused, and then would have me meet him at *Isbel Barnards*, which I told his friend, I should not refuse, if my friends judged it convenient, or because he had upbraided me with my God; I was not unwilling to meete him in the market place, would my friends thither accompany me, and the Magistrates approve it; upon advice with my friends they were not willing I should go to *Isbel Barnards* or the Market-place. Then I sent him word, that if he and his friends would joine with me and mine, in repairing the harmes might by occasion of the meeting in the steeple-house, be done to the seats, I would joine with them in procuring it. But this also, though one of his own party judged it but reasonable, he refused, because he would not put his party upon any charge: then he desired me to nominate some indifferent private house, seeing he judged mine not indifferent, and we judged *Isbel Barnards* as little or lesse indifferent; and I did procure *Mr. Philips* his, where we should have met, had his party, upon viewing of it, liked it; but the Church-warden in the mean while (without whose consent I would not make bold with the Church or steeple-house, or put either my friends or the parish upon the charge of repairs, they having been put to charge before at our former meeting by their occasion) sending me word that we might in the Chancel: so soon as we had that liberty granted, I sent *G. W.* word of it, and accordingly there we met. Now judge Reader whether of us were most guilty of backwardnesse to meete in the publick, so as was convenient, seeing I offered him so reasonable, even in the judgement of some of his own party, and he refused it; but this is no new thing, to hide themselves, and intimately accuse others in deceit. He saies, *The chief thing I drove at, was to make people believe, that there is no man living upon earth that sinneth not, or can be perfectly freed from sin in this life, and that the Prophets and Apostles had sin in them so long as they lived* which though

it's not altogether true; because the main thing, I drove at was not that, but to prove the *Quakers* deceivers. Yet those things, he saies, I drove at, and would have people believe me in, are in part, the very words of the Prophets and holy men of God; and so if I drove at that to make people believe those things, I drove but at the making them believe the truth of the Scriptures, in whose sayings and by consequence *George* indeavoured to drive them from believing them. For, that there is not a just man upon earth that doth good and sinneth not, and no man that sins not, is not mine but *Solomons* by the spirit of truth, I trow, *Eccles.* 7. 20. *1 Kings* 8. 46. and that no man is perfectly freed from sin in all respects in this life, is evident both in *Psal.* 143. 2. and in that sicknesses, diseases, and mortality that came in by sin, abides upon all men till death, yea, and the bodily death that came in by sin, abides upon all till the resurrection: and so long as any fruit of sin abides upon a man, he is not perfectly in all respects freed from sin. And to say as he doth [*that the asserting these things is the making way for my Fathers Kingdome which is upheld by sin, as much as I could*] is evident blasphemy. For God being my Father (at least by creation as he after, though erroneously saies, the Disciples were taught so to call him their Father) his kingdome is not upheld by sin; and if he calls him the Devil, he blasphemeth; or if he judge the Devil to be my Father, as no doubt his charity leads him, yet then he blasphemeth the spirit of truth which breathed in the holy men of God, while he makes the asserting their sayings a warring for the Devils kingdome, that they be their sayings, the places above quoted with, *Rom.* 7. 17, 20, 21, 22, 23. *1 Jam.* 3. 2. *1 John* 1. 8, 10. and 2. 1, 2. make it evident. See Reader how this man discovers his shame and falsehood in althi's oppositions, his intimations that we denyed him liberty to speak in evidence of his (pretended) truths, is so false, that the contrary, namely that when he would have been reading, and at other times he was called upon again and again to answer, he would not for some times yea, and sometime he had liberty, or took it, to talke so much, that I could not have liberty to reply upon him, and the calling out of the company to him to answer or else own himself proved a deceiver, and perhaps sometimes laughing at his folly, is that he calls the incivility towards him, and clamoring of many at once against him. And where he saies that, *many hearing him with soberness, was (as appears) a grief to me, and probably some cause of my publishing of an imperfect relation of the discourse in print to render him, and what he calls the truth, odious, and in my pride to make people believe I had got the victory.* I avouch in the presence of God, that the people hearing him with soberness was no grief at all to me, or any thing that I see as making against me in the people, and if it appears so to him, it's because his eye sees by a false light, and the spirit of truth guides him not therein. I was very much rejoiced in the Lord to see his helpfulness afforded me, and *Geo. Whin.* so made manifest to the people, and the people so satisfied: for which cause

cause also I published as perfect a relation of the discourse of these points spoken to, as possible I could, and could I possibly have come by every word, or fillable of it, I was not afraid nor ashamed to make it publick, knowing right well the more perfectly it had been published, the more perfectly his folly had been made manifest: So that if what I have published in print render him odious, it is because his folly and deceit in the dispute was such as deserved it. As for what he saies, he shall make good against me in the strength of God, it will appear to be but a deceived vapour in him by what I shall (through Gods assistance) say here to his two latter charges, which (he saies) his Treatise makes good, namely: That my Ministry, in which he (falsly) saies, *I commend for sin (just as the Apostle John did in 1 Joh. 1. 8, 10. with 2. 1.) is Anti-Christian and both against the commands, promise and works of God, and leads to the making both the preaching and praying of Christ and the Saints ineffectual, and that. 2. I (like a chollerick envious man against the truth of God and his people) am a forger of lies, a false accuser and slanderer, and so one of the Dragons army, &c.* By this making good, or not making, thou maist judge Reader, whether the strength of God be with him to make good his former against me by dispute, which he would challenge me to in publick, either in market place, Steeple-house or their meeting house in Lin, namely. 1. *That I am out of the steps of the true Ministers, and am in the practice of deceivers, an hypocrite, and no Minister of Christ, and being a parish Priest am guilty of the Priests iniquity in many things against which I have declared. And 2. That I uphold a dead formal worship like the world, whereunto people are not called by the spirit of truth; which is not the true worship, and keep people from the life of God, and my Ministry formal and corrupt.* Which his foolish challenge I shall not accept, both because his folly and fallshood in his boasts of strength, to that may be sufficiently discovered in his failers, of what he boasts he hath done in his Treatise, as also because he therein laies a trap for me, to get occasion to reproach me; for he knows I sent him word, that I should henceforth have no more to do with him, but according to the Apostles counsel reject them; now should I accept his challenge, he and his party would reproach me, as they did upon a lesse coloured occasion as a lyer and false. Besides these being personal charges, and the overflowings of their anger against me, because foiled at the dispute, and such things as these spoken so much as we thought needful in answer to his former book in which he spits such venomous stuff against me, I shall not go about to plead my own cause, but leave it to God; and rather take good Hezekiahs course when Sennacherib railed upon him, that would not have him answered again.

That he is far from making good his charges in the two other points of it spoken to, as he saies in his treatise, these things that follow in answer hereunto, I hope will fully evince.

To my proofes for the Scripture (which he only sets down the quotations without saying any thing to them particularly,) that the Prophets

Prophets, Apostles, and holy men of God (even after they were Prophets, Apostles, and holy men) came confessing themselves sinners, and to have sin. He saies; *I have not made it appear that the Quakers do not so, for they own their confessing sin, and they have confessed their sins to the Lord as they did.* To this I answer, that's evident enough that the Quakers do not both by their not denying our charge against them in our first book, but pleading for their concealed sinfulness, and by what they say here; for, observe I pray, 1. They do but say, they own the Apostles and Prophets, confessing their sins, seeing they say a man born of God hath no sin to confesse, either then they deny the Apostles and Prophets, when such, to have been born of God, or how do they own their confessing sin? Nay, George saies, *Paul* (and he may as well say it of all the rest) spake not of his own state, but other mens.

2. What if they own their confessing sins, that proves not that the Quakers do confesse them. The Scribes and Pharisees owned the Prophets doings, yet they did not as the Prophets. Thirdly, He sayes they have confest them; that implies they do not so now. But the Apostles and Prophets do not say only they had in times past confest and forsaken them; but even when Apostles and Prophets confest them, in the present; see else *David* again and again as *Psal.* 6. and 19. and 25. and 38. and 40. so *Paul Rom.* 7. 17, 20. We find no time of the Apostles and Prophets, while here, in which they said, they had no sin in them. But it seems the Quakers would be thought to be better than the Prophets and Apostles: As for their denying themselves and sin, I would they did as truly as pretend it, but their lying, falsifying, and passionate language, discovers the contrary in them, for all their saying as this peice of *Georges* sufficiently proves, his reproaching the Ministers by the name of Priests, as he doth me often with much bitterness, as Priest *Horne*; this Priest, this scornfull Priest, *Horne*, &c. As they argue him not to have put off all malice, bitterness, &c. So are they not to be mattered by us; nor his reproaching any of us, as not forsaking our sins, but pleading for them; its likely *Dauids* enemies did so in *Psal.* 38. 15, 16, 17. to which *George* hath given no answer, though alleged to prove the Quakers such towards us, as *Dauids* enemies were to him. Doubtlesse these Quakers would have accused the Apostles of not forsaking sin too but pleading for it, had they lived in their time, and heard them say sin dwelt in them, and that in many things they all offend, especially they would have taxed *David* with it that is so often confessing his sin, as in part I have nored. But see how silly his pretended proof is, that sin doth not abide in all men the term of this life, and that they are out of the spirit and life of the Prophets and holy men of God, it is this, *They know the fear of the Lord, which is to depart from iniquity, which fear keeps the heart clean, and such as live in it shall not depart from the Lord,* *Jer.* 32. 40. Jas if where men know, or have the fear of the Lord, there is no sin in them, and as if to have sin in a man, and to depart from the Lord, was all one. See the folly and falsehood

of this passage. Did not *David* know the fear of the Lord which is clean, when he said, Psalm 19. 9. *the fears of the Lord is clean enduring for ever?* or did he speak at random? and yet did not pray presently after, *cleanse thou me from my secret sins?* or had not *Paul* the fear of the Lord, or did he depart from the Lord when he delighted in the Law of the Lord in his inner man, and yet found another law in his members, warring against the law of his mind? Rom. 7. 21, 23. Doth not these passages evidence, that *George Whitehead* is so far from being in the strength of God, as he boasts, that he is a man of no judgement (that is, right understanding) that cannot distinguish between sins being in men, and the heart departing from the Lord by sin offending in a mans walking and leaving the way. How silly also it is that he accounts it absurd for me to say, *That people ought to account the Quakers accursed, whom we have said to be an heavy judgement of God to us in this Nation, for then they must count the judgement of God accursed. And again ps. 11. That in striving against, and reviling the Quakers, we strive against and revile Gods judgement, when as we should patiently bear Gods judgements?* for doth not judgement begin at the house of God? 1 Pe. 4. 17. and doth he not ordain wicked men for judgement, such as the *Caldeans*? Heb. 1. 12. and false teachers? Jude 4. yea, and *Satan* too, as to *Job*? and may we not account *Satan* his instruments accursed, and yet not count Gods judgement so? or because the judgement of God is just and holy, are the wicked men ordained as a judgement holy and just too? If God should judge a Nation by sending wild beasts among them, must they patiently let the wild beast devour their folks, because they be a judgement sent of God? or else do they resist the judgement of God? I trow not; its a judgement that we must be put to strive against such beasts, and yet that judgement we may patiently bear in all our straits against them. Sure if G. W. cannot distinguish between the judgement of God as a judgement from him, and as to the conditions of the thing which he uses as judgements, he is but a blind guide and they that follow him will fall into the ditch with him. Whereas I say, the true Apostles and Prophets never use to speak of themselves as sinlesse. G. W. saies its false, for the true Prophet saies, *all his judgements were before me, and as for his statutes I did not depart from them, I was also upright before him, and have kept my selfe from my iniquity,* 2 Sam. 22. 24. But mark here Reader, that *David* acknowledges he had then iniquity, for how was iniquity his, if there was none in him, his keeping himself from it, is the same with that in the Apostle, of not walking after the flesh, which also implies flesh to be in them, and intice them that walk not after it. And *David* speaks there of his innocency in respect of his carriages toward *Saul* and his other enemies in the things they accused him in, and pretended as just causes of their persecuting him, the Psalm being pend upon that occasion as the title shews, besides which he committed many sins, though yet then notwithstanding it is said of him, that he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not a side from any thing that he commanded

commanded him all the daies of his life, save only in the matter of *Vriab the Hittite*, 1 *Kings* 15. 5. But in those things between him and his enemies, God rewarded him (not after his iniquitie which he kept himself from, as in another place, *Psal.* 107. 10. he hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us after our iniquities; in which he acknowledges, even he among others, that they had sins and iniquities, but they being kept from serving and living in them, God dealt not with them after them, but after the righteousness and cleanness found, according to the spirit or inward man; even as *Paul* when he had said, he served with his mind the Law of God, but with his flesh the law of sin; yet adds, there is therefore no condemnation to them that walke not after the flesh, but after the spirit; God therein deals with them according to their cleanness in Christ, and in their walking after the spirit, and not after their sin in their members: so that quotation also clearly failes him. It is true too that God promises that his people shall be all righteous, and clean from all their filchiness; yea, and they are righteous in Christ, and his blood actually and continually cleanseth them; but that proves not that the Saints and Prophets ever boasted themselves to be without sin: But even they that said, the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin, say too immediately after, if we say we have no sin we deceive our selves; nay, seeing Gods afflicting his people, is to purge away their sin, as *Isa.* 27. 8, 9. and the temptations he tries them with, are to try and purifie their faith from the mixtures therein, (both of them being as baptizings with water and fire to those ends) it appears, that so long as they are subject to afflictions and tryals, (which is so long as they live, death it self being one way of afflicting and trying) they have drosse and uncleanness to be purged from, and God is performing his promises to them therein, that they may be all perfectly righteous even in themselves, in the new heaven and earth and new Jerusalem, where shall be no unclean thing, and where shall be the full accomplishment of Gods righteousness upon them, to which also *Isa.* 60. alludes. As for those that *John* saw *Rev.* 14. that were without fault before the Throne of God, and that could sing to the Lord a new song, I say all that heartily believe in Christ, and are not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, it is Christs office to present them holy unblameable and without reproof in Gods sight, *Col.* 1. 22. 23. not because they are sinless in themselves, but because they are in him who is their perfect righteousness; nor is that the new song they sing, that in us is no fault or blame; but while they accuse themselves and confesse their sins, he is just and faithful and forgives them, and so presents them in himself without blame before God; and their song is praises or salvation to the Lord, as in *Psal.* 40. 23. *David* sung that new song, and yet complained of innumerable sins, and evils compassing him about in himself: See else *Psal.* 40. 11, 12, 13. So that still here appears in *George* nothing but ignorant mistakes, or the spirit of deceit. He adds, that that song cannot be sung by those that

are in their iniquities, and pleading for *sin*, being enemies to the state of the new creature. But he herein grossly prevaricates and deceives his Reader, confounding mens having sin in them, and confessing their sins with men being in sin, and pleading for it; between which is a vast difference: *Paul* was not in his sin, but in *Christ*, nor did he plead for sin, but strive against it and deny it, when he said, sin was in him, and bewailed that he did what he would not. We say not then, that the true Apostles and Prophets were in sin, and pleaded for it, but had sin in them, and bewailed their sins; nor do we in so saying, plead for sin, no more than they did. Therefore *George* herein bewrayes his great ignorance and mistake, and his conclusion is meer vanity and deceit, viz. *That they have a cloud of witnesses, and many evidences for their testimonie that it is of God, and that what they hold is truth, and that all that own God must own them herein.* Which is all false, as by what is said may be seen.

I sayd, that when *John* said, 1 *Iob.* 4. 17. As he is so are we in this world, he could not mean it, we are without sin, because that's contrary to his own expressions, 1 *Iob.* 4. 8. This *G. W.* railes on me for, and adds, *That John who knew the state in which they had sin, and in which if they said they had no sin, they deceived themselves, &c. did not say they should have sin so long as in the world, for he saith, little children let no man deceive you, he that doth righteousness is righteous, as he is righteous, 1 John 3. 6, 7.* Plainly implying that they are deceivers that say, men cannot be without sin while they are in the World, &c. Mind Reader the wildness of his answers, & how he leaves my saying undisproved, do what he can; for what if *Iohn* did not say in expresse words, that they should have sin so long as they were in this world; Seeing that Scripture speaks of what they were at present (as he is, so we are in this world?) it's enough to prove, that what *Iohn* said there, of their present state, may not be interpreted as the *Quakers* do, that they were then without sin, seeing it crosses what he said before of their present estate, in that respect. And what though he that doth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous; that proves not that he that doth righteousness hath no sin in him; for he that confesses his sins, doth righteousness therein, otherwise how is it righteousness and faithfulness in God to forgive him, 1 *Iohn* 1. 9. So then he that, in such a sense as in that, 1 *Iohn* 1. 9. confesseth his sins, is righteous as *Christ* is righteous, for *Christ* is his righteousness; and yet he that confesseth his sin, is not without sin in himselfe, for then he should confesse a falsehood: And what though (as he adds) that in 1 *Iohn* 4. 17. have relation to their dwelling in God and God in them (that's but *George's* affirmation) do not they that walke in the light, as he is in the light, dwell in God, and God in them? and yet have sins that the blood of *Christ* cleanseth them from: and if they sayd, they have no sin, they deceive themselves, 1 *Iohn* 1. 7, 8. I say, the true Apostles & Prophets used not to glory in their perfection, and sinlesse. He answers: *Then they used not to glory in Christ, and who is*

it that will believe this deceit, for Christ was their righteousness and perfection. See Reader, what a deceitful man is this, that leaves out the word sinfulness, which I added on purpose, to shew what perfection I meant of, and then to ask if the Apostles gloried not in a perfection, which he was sure I meant not of, for though Christ be by the gift of God their perfection, yet he is not their personal sinfulness or selfe perfection, that I spake of; these men are good at little, but at crafty catching at, and perverting expressions.

Again, to our saying they reproached us, for owning our selves part of the Nation, guilty of sin with them. He taxeth us, *For finding fault with the Teachers and people, and yet now we are joyned with them, and guilty of sin with them, and that I joine my self with the blind watchmen, and dumb dogs, and then taxe us with hypocrisie and deceit, for one while declaring against the Teachers, and people of the Nation, and another while to joine with them.*] But marke Reader, that I said not we joined our selves with them in their sinning, but in confessing sin; that is, we confesse ours with theirs, nor say we, that we are guilty of all their sins, but guilty of sin. And will not his charges of us, for this, fall upon the Prophet *Isaiah*, did not he one while inveigh against the watchmen and the people, yea many times, and yet another while joine in himself among them, in confessing the Nations sins, in *Isa.* 59. 10, 11, 12, 13. when he said, we grope for the wall like the blind, and we grope as if we had no eyes, and our transgressions are multiplied before thee, and our sins testify against us. Did *Isaiah* speak those things of himself and the Disciples, as a distinct party from the body of the Nation, or as joining in the Nation with themselves? If as a distinct party, would not *George* say then, they were hypocrites for faulting others, and being as bad themselves? If as joining themselves in with the Nation, were they not guilty of the same that *George* throwes upon us, if we be therefore guilty, as he saies? Surely all that read these things, may see herein G. W.'s weakness. My charges of them denying Christ to have that body glorified in heaven, in which he suffered, is not disproved by my saying, they granted the same body that suffered was glorified at Gods right hand, because (as elsewhere we have cleared it) they meant equivocally in that saying, and not of the personal body of Christ: but to that and their denyal of the resurrection of mens bodys, we have spoken fullyer, in our answer to their book against us. Nor will my saying, they are persons of no judgement in these things, save them from being guilty of endeavouring to subvert the faith about them, seeing judgement, in Scripture expression, signifies right understanding, as in *Isa.* 42. 14. and 59. 8. and they that have no understanding to do good, may be wise to do evil, as the Prophet saies. *Jer.* 4. 22.

To that of our Saviour, Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect, alledged by G. W. to proove, that some men are without sin here. I noted, That men may in Scripture sense be said to be perfect, that

have sin in them. Instancing in *Jed.* and *Asa.* And 2. That exhortations to things, prove not those things to be perfectly attained by any here, nor doth the Scripture ever say, Let not sin be in you, &c. The first of these *George* passes over, which, would he have defended himselfe to purpose, he should not have done. To the 2. he saies, *To what end or effect then was his exhortation? What, must men be under the commands after death which they had in their life time, and not till then fulfill them? here's darkness indeed* (saith he) *made manifest, and the command put a far off.* To that consider, are all commands to no end and effect, that are not fulfilled by them to whom they are given? Sure then many commands given of God, must be concluded to be so, for how many commands of his are broken by men, & not fulfilled of them? *Neh. 9. 29. Jer. 32. 23.* Shall we say therefore they were to no end or effect? Sure his end is that we should presse, in his strength, after what is commanded, to our ability, knowing that he accepts through Christ our endeavour, though we attain not here its perfection: and that where we are short we acknowledge it, and in the sense of it, being humbled in ourselves, give glory to God, in, and for Christ, in whom we are (and by whom we shall be made) perfect; as *Paul* said of himselfe, to will was present with him, even to will all that the commandment requires, but how to perform it, he found not: yet was not the commandment without end or effect, in as much as in the innerman, he delighted in it and groaned for the day of perfect liberty, when there should be no let to do it perfectly; and thanked God in Christ Jesus, in whom he being perfect, was not under condemnation, for what he found not; as for being under commands after death, I say men shall fulfill commandments after death given in this life; for must not the spirits of just men love God after the bodily death and in the resurrection? yea, shall they not then love him with all their heart, more perfectly than now they do, when they more perfectly enjoy him? And yet they are commanded now to love him. So that the darknesse appears in G. W. To the other, that the Scripture saies not any where, Let not sin be in you. He saies, *Is it not all one to say, be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect, or wash you, make yee clean, keep Gods commandment, love and serve him with all the heart, which must be fulfilled: then what part of man must be a subject for sin to dwell in while he lives here?* To the first of these, the saying, Be ye perfect, &c. Is not the saying, Let not sin be in you? Those words are not these, & no more necessarily included in them, than Let no weaknesse, infirmity or mortality be in you, or no ignorance of any thing in heaven or earth; seeing God is as perfectly free from them, as from sin: but the sayings of Scripture are to be interpreted according to their scope, which there appears to be perfect in testifying or extending love to enemies, as well as friends, as God doth. As God is so perfect in charity, as to love and do good to the evil, and good, so would Christ have his disciples in an answerable sense, which how G. W. and the *Quakers* faile in their bitterness and reproaches sufficiently evidence. Nor is it all one to say, Wash you, make you

you clean, and let no sin be in you; for these phrases alluding to the washings under the Law; as it was not one and the same there, to say, Wash you from some uncleanness defiling the flesh, and let no such unclean or defiling humor, as of blood or other matter, be in your bodies; for the cleanest body had such humors in it, as, issuing out upon it, would defile it; So, neither is it all one to say, Wash you from your sins and defilements (which is done in confessing and denying them) and let no sin be in you; the being of sin in men, being not imputed, were not consented to, or sided with, no more than the being of unclean humors within the body, were accounted to men when they did not issue out, to touch and ly upon the body. As *Rom. 7. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25.* and *8. 1.* Nor is it all one to say, Keep the commandments, love God with all the heart; for that requires no more, as to Gods gracious acceptation, than that as he is in the light, we walk in the light, and love him with all the ability of knowing and loving here given us; which is nor, while here, so perfect as to have no ignorance of God, and so no sin in us; however those sayings are not that. To that question, In what part must sin dwell, &c. I say sin will, whither we will or no, dwell in our members while they be mortal. *Rom. 7. 17. 20.* with *Psalms 143. 2.* So as no man living, should God enter into judgement with him, can be justified in his sight, which, he saies next } *Proves not that the Prophets and Apostles had sin in them while they lived, and seeing the Scripture it selfe doth not prove it, he saies, it's no matter of my word, who (he saies) perverts the Scripture therein, both belying me and the Scripture, for the Scripture gives this as the reason wherefore David would not that God should enter into judgement with him, though his servant, that no man living should be justified in his sight. Doth not, no man living, include no Prophet or Apostle, as men while here living, Suitable to that, Psal. 130. 3. if thou Lord mark iniquities, Lord who shall stand? as implying none should. So that Scripture proves what I asserted, unless the Apostles and Prophets could be proved not to have been men so long as they lived.*

He saies, *That Scripture includes not the Saints, as to prove them unjustified, who were changed from that state wherein no man living could be justified in the sight of God, and were come through the death and the many tryalls and tribulations into the life and righteousness of Christ.*] See here, Reader, if this man hath any thing but deceit? And is it a matter for his words without Scripture prooffe? Was not David a Saint, when the servant of the Lord, and desires God to answer him in his faithfulness and righteousness? who is the accuser of the Saints here, but G. W. that implies, that David was not a Saint? or is no man living a Saint? Must they stay from being Saints till they are dead and Canonized by the Pope? If the Saints while they live here be men that live, then cannot they be justified if God should enter into judgement with them; either then say, that the Saints are not men living, while here a-
live

live, or that *David* said false, or else that G. W. is a deceiver, and not to be listened to by us. And yet we say not, that the Saints be so included as to be unjustified while here, but that is not because they could be justified, should God enter into judgement with them, though he may judge them through him; he deals not with them immediately, as, or according to what they are in themselves, or according to their sins, *Psal.* 103. 10, 11. But in, and according to his good will in Christ, what he speaks of a state in which they are come through the death, &c. What be they but his additions to the Scriptures, of which *David* saying gives no intimation. Is there any Saint living here in any state that is not a man living? or is it said, no man in the death, or that is, not yet passed through the death, can be justified? Alas, what be these things, but sorry deceitful evasions from plain truth. He saies, *I relate part of our discourse deceitfully and imperfectly*, and yet after questions, whether I relate it or not, and then saies down part of what is related about *Pauls* groining to be delivered, &c. But wherein I relate it imperfectly, much lesse deceitfully, he shoves not, only saies, I have belyed and wronged his words and left out the greatest part of them that cleared his answer: and yet afterwards saies, he could not have liberty to open what he said so much there as here; and yet if the Reader compare what I related, with the sum of what he saies here, where he took his own liberty assuredly, without molestation from us, he will find, that besides his quotations and perversions of what he quotes from *John*, *Jeremy* & *Isa.* of which he then made no mention, I clearly laid down the substance of his sayings, and that he could not have liberty there to clear his sayings, is so far from truth, that we often urged him to answer, and he was so void of any clearing answer, that he would have left the argument to read on our book what did nothing concerne it. And that I have cast no lye nor scornfull slander upon him in saying, he was baffled (as he here charges me) may be evident from this, that to my demand of him, Whether the Apostles and Prophets, were not Apostles and Prophets when as he granted, they confessed they had sin: he denies not that he granted, yea, nor that to my questioning, what state it was, then of which he said they had a time and state that they had no sin: he replied, when they were born of God, nor that to my question whether they were not born of God when Apostles and Prophets? he answered, that they (as *Paul* for instance) had a time when not born of God, viz. when he groaned and travelled, waiting for the adoption, nor doth he deny, that he went about to clear up that, that he was not born of God while he so waited for the redemption of the body, only faults me for not giving a full relation of what he said to it: now then I do demand, if he was not baffled, to what purpose did he (upon my quoting 1 *John* 5. 1. to prove that he was born of God all the time he was an Apostle) fly to another answer; that *Paul* spake to conditions below his own? If he was not quite beat off his other answer, why fled he to this? which cannot

be true and the other too : For if *Paul* was but then groaning to be born, and not born of God, then spake he of his own state; and if he spake to others states below his own then, then is it not true that he had, while an Apostle, or then when he said, he so waited a time in which he was not born of God, so these two shifts clearly overthrow one the other. And whereas he saies, *many that heard the dispute can witness against me for impudent belying and slandering him*. I call God to witnesse, in whose presence I am, and dare appeal to all indifferent and understanding Auditors, that I have not in any thing belyed or slandered him, much lesse impudently. Let us see what he himself saith he said, *Paul witnessed*, saith he, *the groaning and travelling in pain before the birth was born in him, or before he was born of God, or in the state of him that was born of God*. (Mark Reader his own inconstancy and confusion, as not knowing how to phrase it) intending (saith he) as *1 Iohn 3. 9.* who cannot sin, it seems he was so baffled that he could not then tell us his intencion, nor now doth explain here those in *1 Job. 3.* are said to be born of God, only seems to imply, that he thinks there be other kinds of being born of God than that speaks of, which would or could he have cleared himself, he should have proved, and not so spoken without distinction and understanding. He adds, *that Paul could sin, when he could do the evil he would not*] which yet he proves not, seeing he expressly saies, it was not he that did it, but sin that dwelt in him, and to the *Galatians*, that the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, they could not do what they would, and so it was there with him, as the law in his members, warring against the law in his minde, he could not do what in his spirit he would, to the inner man or spirit delighting in the law of God, and lusting against the flesh or law in his members, he could not do what his flesh would, and what sin in him did : yea, what his members or flesh, and so he (as denominated by it) did, he as in the spirit, or according to the inner man (according to which *John* saies, whosoever is born of God cannot sin) could not do. What he adds about *his travelling in pain for deliverance from the bondage of corruption, and that where the son or birth from above is born, the glorious liberty of the Sons of God is enjoyed, which the creatures waited for, and the travelling in pain for deliverance is ceased, as also the first clause of his saying above related, that Paul witnessed the groaning and travelling in pain before the birth was born in him*. Is all besides the bush, as in our relation of the discourse also is evidenced, for as I then and there cleared it, what *Paul* saies of travelling in pain and of deliverance from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God, he saies of the whole creation, distinguishing himself and the Sons of God, who had then received the first fruites of the spirit from the creature before spoken of, as is clear, *Rom. 8. 20, 21, 22, 23.* for he saies, not only they, but we ourselves also that have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within our selves, waiting for the adoption, the redemption of the body. It's clear, that the Apostles there, in *ver. 19, 20. &c.* speaks of the restitution of all things spoken of by the Prophets.

phets (as *Act.* 3. 21. When the glory of the Sons of God, that now suffer with Christ (as *ver.* 17.) even to the bodily death, shall be revealed; and when the creature it self, as distinct from them, even the fabrick of the world shall be renewed and freed from the bondage of corruption, that it is by occasion of mens sins subjected to in hope, for which freedome in it's kind, it groans and travels together till now, and for the redemption of the body, then also to be effected, from the bondage, to what it suffers now, and shall lye under, in some things till then, they the Sons of God distinct from the other creatures, also waiting, groaned; what groaning or travelling was necessary to precede the being born of God, so as to be made Sons of God, *Paul* and the other holy Apostles and Prophets had it in their receiving Christ, before they were made Apostles and Prophets, though I deny not but in that birth there might be degrees and growth after, nor will the perfection of it, be as to the body till the resurrection thereof from the dead: So that yet it abides firme, that *Paul*, when born of God, confessed he had sin dwelt yet in him. Whereas he adds, *That I perverted his comparison, and that it was not intended to prove that Paul was not born into the world according to the flesh wherewith he travelled, &c.* I answer, that G. W. grossly plaies the Sophister in representing me as wresting his comparison to any such intention. It's evident what I said is to this purpose, that as no woman travells with natural children before she herself be born, and be a woman; So neither did *Paul* groan for the resurrection of the body, till himself was born of God in the mind and spirit, and so that he was born of God, when he so groaned as he there speaks of. His quotation of *John* 16. 21, 22. is impertinent, for Christ speaks there of the sorrow they had before the spirit was powred down upon them, before they were sent out into all the world, as *Act.* 1. 8. with *Luke* 24. 49. which *Paul* had before he was an Apostle, and so

Act. 9. 17. before he made that confession of sin, in *Rom.* 7. 17. 20. or else also of their having sorrow in travelling to bring forth the knowledge of Christ in others, and their joy after in their being brought forth unto God, and most fully when they shall be presented with them, together at the great appearance of Christ in his glory at the resurrection of the just, as 2 *Cor.* 4. 11, 12, 13, 14. that in *Jer.* 30. 6. speaking of *Jacobs* sorrow in captivity, and their joy in their return again, is yet more impertinently alledged by him, and so is that in *Isa.* 9. 6. abused; for the Prophet *Isaiah* doth not witness as *George* pretends; that in them a child was born, & in them a son was given; but to them, which he speaks prophetically of Christ given in the counsel, purpose and promise of God, and to be born in his time, which he speaks of, for its certainty as if then accomplished, though not to themselves, but to us in these after ages, they ministred the things now preached as accomplished; as the Apostle *Peter* tells us, 1 *Pet.* 1. 11, 12. His confusion in saying one while, *The Disciples travelled in sorrow before the man, or birth from above, was born in them, and presently, that they were in pain before they be-*

came that birth, I passe, as also his judging me as ignorant of the states he speaks of, their talking of a babe in them, fashioning their bodies to the likeness here of Christs glorious body, I have writ and yet do testifie against, as arguing their unbelief, and denyal of the resurrection of the body, and the power of Christ thereto, which makes them turne the things thereabout into fancies and allegories of their own devising, which shews them to be such as subvert the faith, and such as are to be counted accursed. That, I wickedly belyed the people in saying they all laught, because many of his friends, and others that were sober minded did not join with them, &c. Is as false as that Mathew wickedly belyed the people of Judea and about Jordan, in saying all Judea, and all the regions about Jordan went out to John, and were baptized of him, when it appears that the Pharisees rejected the counsel of God, and were not baptized of him, Mat. 3. 5, 6. with Luke 7. 30. I distinguished the people both from his friends and our selves, but are his friends no sober minded men, that they are distinguished from them; I speak of the generality of the people, if there were one or two did otherwise, it's more then I observed.

To that of, 1 John 5. 1. Whosoever believes that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. he cavils that I did it without understanding and without distinction, whereas it was his part being the answer, to have distinguished, if he understood any ground for it, and not mine, who was opponent; but something he will say, though to no purpose, how much more truly might I have said, what he charges me with, of the generality of his own quotations in his answer, as that in 2 Sam. 22. 1 Job. 3. 9. and 1 John 4. 17. and yet when in my postscript I distinguished of that in 1 John 3. 9. He snatches at the first part of my distinction, (*viz.* that whosoever is perfectly born of God (as the spirits of just men made perfect, and the men themselves in the Resurrection) cannot sin at all; but none so perfectly born of God here) taking no notice of the other propositions that speak of men, as here born of God, and then cries out. *Oh what pittifull stuffe is here to imagine men are not perfectly born of God, so as not to sin till deceased; this would make the works of God imperfect here, when all his works are perfect; &c* then taxes me as if I had said, that those that were born of God in the Apostles daies, were some that were deceased and risen again. Whereas I in the other part of the distinction shewed how those that are born of God, while here, may be said not to sin, and that they cannot sin; but why is it such pittifull stuffe, to say, that the spirits of just men deceased, & the men themselves when raised, are, or shall be, more perfectly born of God, then while here living? do they gain no degree of perfection by death? where then is the advantage they have by it? Nor shall they gain none in the resurrection neither, when seeing him as he is, they shall be like him? 1 John 3. 2. or have the present propositions of truth, all their fulfilling at the present? He that hath the Son hath life, 1 John 5. 12. Have they not so that are deceased in him? and shall they not have him, and life more fully

in the resurrection, if G. believe it? And why must the work of God be imperfect, if men be not perfectly born of God here? was the work of God, all whose works are perfect, imperfect when Paul said, not that I am already perfect, or have already attained? *Philip. 3. 12.* or because the Fathers dyed in the faith, not having received the promises God, having provided some better thing for us, that they without us, should not be made perfect, *Heb. 11. 39.* Were the works of God therefore imperfect till these last ages? If so, then why not so too till the resurrection? If they were perfect alwaies, and in all generations, then mens not being perfectly born of God, while here, hinders not their perfection, no more then *Pauls* or the Fathers being not perfect did. Surely G. W. is very silly, if he think as he writ here, and a very deceiver, if he thought otherwise, and they be simple that are catcht with such chaff, or worthy to be blind still that will not see it, but let us see what distinction he hath devised upon, *1 John 5. 1.* to save his credit. He saies, *It's true according to Johns testimony of a true believer, who by faith hath victory over the world, and so being born of God, is not under the bondage of corruption, &c.* But such he saies *I. H. doth not own while men are here.* Jolly and falsehood, jolly, for he implies, that *Johns* saying is not true without distinction, and yet *John* said it without distinction; for he said not, whosoever so, or so, believeth that Jesus is the Christ, but in general expressions whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. True it is that he saies *ver. 4.* whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith, but then in *ver. 5.* he explicates what their faith was answerable to, *ver. 1.* saying, who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believes that Jesus is the Son of God, which is all one with whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ; clearly signifying, that he that believeth that, is born of God, and so overcometh the world, even the spirit, rudiments, and pollutions of the world so as none else: and that they who believe not (that is, with their heart believe not) that Jesus (even that Jesus of *Nazareth* whom the Jews crucified bodily, and God raised from the dead (for besides him the Apostles did preach no other Jesus, name, or thing, within men or without men to be the Saviour, or salvation of God to be believed on, *Acts 4. 10, 11, 12.*) is the Christ the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, the annointed one to bring us back to God, the propitiation for our sins, the righteousness and life given us of God; I say he implies that they who believe not him to be the Christ, or annointed Saviour, in, and through, what he hath done and suffered for us in the body of his flesh, and is become for us therethrough, and is doing for us in heaven on Gods right hand, as the great Mediator and high Priest for us, and from heaven, to, and in us, as the great Apostle and Prophet of our profession, and Lord of all; and in what he is appointed to do, and will do at his glorious descent from heaven, and appearing, and kingdom then to be revealed in glory; they have not, nor do overcome

the

the world : But whatever be their pretences and appearances to men of being out of, and above the world, they are overcome of the world, and are in the worlds state ; being led of and by the god of the world, and rudiments of it, which lead men that seek after righteousness and hope toward God, to seek it in themselves and their doings, mortifications and frames ; but not to go out of themselves into Christ and his name, to accept of him (even that Jesus of Nazareth, as made sin for them, and raised again for their justification, and glorified at Gods right hand) for their wisdom, righteousness, holynesse and redemption, and so to have their rejoycing in him, and expectation from him, and of him, at his appearing : they who have so received him and abide in him, are indeed born of God, and have overcome the world : But they that do not so receive him, are in and of the world, who neglecting him, and counting faith in him foolishnesse, live and rejoyce in their own good meanings, honesty, zeal, blamelesse, mortifications and devotions, as the Pharisees and some false Apostles did, who yet were of the world, though they had avoluntary humility and shew of wisdom therein, in neglecting the body, &c. *Col. 2. 18. 23.* And much men may have that way, and great appearance of having overcome the world, because they can, and do deny themselves of many grosser comforts and vanities of it, and indure much voluntary hardship or sufferings from others of it, as the Priests of *Baal*, *1 Kings 18. 28, 40.* And the old Philosophers, and wordly religious amongst both *Turks* and *Papists*, who also glory in such things, and yet are deeply in the spirit of the world, even as by that description of the overcomer of the world, here given by *John*; the *Quakers*, so called, are evidenced to them, that judge ~~not~~ carnally by outward appearance (as most do, which makes them have so many Proselytes) but by the spirituall eye of faith, however they boast themselves as perfect, and vaunt themselves as out of, and overcomers of the world; yet they are most deeply and dangerously, though most mystically, and to the world-ward indiscernably overcome of the world, and the spirit of the world ; as being most out of, and reprobate concerning the faith that overcomes the world, viz. That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, they accounting his coming in the flesh (as *Rick. Hubberthorne* seconded by *G. W.*) to be but a figure, and touching his being in heaven and work there, and coming thence, being most dangerously corrupt and unbelievers ; having their rejoycing and glorying not in that person of Jesus and his sufferings and sacrifice according to the Scripture ; as their book, in answer to us, and their writings generally evidence, but in themselves, their sinlesse pretended, and in their actings and sufferings, by which it is evident that they are not born of God, nor have overcome the world whatever outside appearances they walke and glory in.

2. Because I produced according to *Johns* testimony without distinction or alteration, and meant it only of true believing. 3. He saies it's true of true believers ; as if he would imply that *Paul* and the other holy

men, when they said they had sin in them, were not true believers, though in some other false sense believe that Jesus is the Christ; what, were the Apostles hypocrites when they said they had sin in them; that *George* thinks them not then to have been true believers? For if they were not true believers, they were feigned believers; and we may well bear *G. W.*'s railing language of us, and his judging us to be hypocrites, if he judged the Apostles, when Apostles, were such, sure *G. W.* did better before, when he waved it, and fled before the power of God in it, than to rake up such an evasion, as implies his taxing the Apostles to be no true believers when they confessed their sins; or that they had not overcome the world, when they were translated out of it, into Christ, and held forth the faith of Christ against all oppositions of the World; then he is guilty of falsehood; in saying *John* describes the true believers to be from under the bondage of corruption, when he makes no mention of the bondage of corruption, though that they are so in some sense is true; but then he saies false, and belies me in saying, that I own not such while men are here, for in such a sense, as true believers are free from the bondage of corruption, that is, from being detained under the guilt of sin and condemnation for it, or the dominion of it, so as to inflave them to it; I own believers, though not from the being of it in their members, is it all one to have corruption in a man, yea, and in many things to offend, and to be under the bondage of corruption? Was *James* under the bondage of corruption, as corruption signifies sin, when he said, in many things we offended all; or *John*, when he said, If we say we have no sin we deceive our selves, &c. Surely *G. W.* had need to goe to school to learn more understanding before he be a teacher, that cannot distinguish things that so broadly differ. He saies, *A man must believe that Jesus is the Christ, and believe in him too, before he be born of God, as Christ said believed in the light, that ye may be the children of the light.* What is this but to fight against the Apostle *John*, and to tell him, Nay *John* thou saist not truly in saying, who ever believes that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. Men may believe that and yet not be born of God, for that goes before a mans being born of God, and yet some things are before others in order of nature, that yet are not without them; as he that hath life hath breath, & yet, in order of nature, life is before breath: & so though it be true, that men must believe in the light, that they may be the children of the light; yet, it followes not, that some do believe in it that are not the children of it, and yet even they that are born of God, and so are children of the light, may be further born of it, and so more the children of God; that is, like unto God, as the Disciples when born of God (for God was their Father) yet Christ bids them to love their enemies, &c. That they might be the children of their Father, *Mat. 6. 44, 45.* And yet again, There is some difference between believing in the light, and believing Jesus to be the Christ, some did believe in the light, before they believed that Jesus is the Christ as *Nathaniel* and *Cornelius* and divers others. So that here is nothing in

Gen. yet, but deceit, and opposition to the Scripture sayings, nay, *G* is broadly contradictory to *John* the Apostle, and sticks not to make him a lyer, plainly afterward, as well as falsely to perswade people that some of his party perceived my deceit. For saith he, *What people are there of any understanding, even among those Priests, which this Priest Horne calls greedy dogs, strong to appetite, that do not believe that Jesus is the Christ? Are they therefore born of God?*] What is this but to cast the lye upon *John*, for being so rash as to say, whosoever believeth Jesus is the Christ, is born of God, when as he saies, such as he reviles as the worst of men, do that, and yet are not born of God? Judge Reader, Whom shall we here believe? the Apostle *John* or *Geo. Whitehead*? Is it not better and truer to say, what ever men perswade themselves of, and what ever they pretend, they do not believe Jesus to be the Christ, that are not born of God, than thus rashly to give the Apostle the lye: That *George* fled to another shift when beat by that Scripture from his former answer, that the Apostles were not born of God while they confessed sin, he denies not; but indeavours to justify here, what he therein said. For he saies here again, that *The Apostle condescended to the Romans to several states which he passed through, and which was below his own, when he writ to them.* Which is not to the purpose, For when he writes to the Romans of the states, he had passed through, he writes of them as things past, not as present, as *Rom.* 5. 10. When we were enemies he reconciled us; he saies not, we are yet enemies, so *Chap.* 7. 9. I was alive without the Law, but when the Law came, sin revived and I dyed; and so in *1 Tim.* 1. 13. Who was before a blasphemer and a Persecutor and injurious; we never find him when he was an Apostle, to say, I am a blasphemer, &c. But of sin being in him, he writes in the present time; I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, there dwells no good thing, and I am carnal, sold under sin, (not, I sell my self to sin as *Abab*, but am sold as by an other, with reference to what was done to him in *Adam*, and yet remained upon him, as to the flesh,) and that he spake of himself too, and not of others excluding himself, is evident, *ver.* 25. So then I my selfe (marke he saies I my self) with my mind serve (he saies not did serve) the Law of God, but with my flesh the Law of sin. Should we say, we our selves do what we only mean others do, he and his fellowes would call us lyers, and yet he fears not to fasten such an imputation in effect upon the Apostle, one after another.

He would confirme his former saying from *Rom.* 6. 19. which is to as little purpose, as if he had quoted *Gen.* 1. 1. For the Apostle there speaks nothing of himself, or of any state that he saies he was then in, as mentioning his own person, but speaking of spiritual things under earthly metaphors (as of Masters and Servants, and freedom from servitude) He saies, *I speak after the manner of men, because of the infirmities of your flesh.* But is this the manner of men, to speak untruths of themselves, as to say, they are in that state they are not, to make their speech more

more understandable, or doth the Apostle speak any thing sounding to that sense there? He saies not there, I yeeld my members servants to uncleannesse; but as ye have (in time past) yielded your members servants to uncleannesse, &c. so yeeld your members now servants of righteousness. Was it not as understandable, for the Apostle to have said, I did sometime find a Law in my members, but now I have got rid of it, and there is no sin in me, as if it had been so as to say, I do see a law in my members? yea, might not this more encourage them to sin than that, if it be as G. W. often casts upon us a pleading for sin, to confess that sin is in the Saints? It clearly appears in all this still, that G. W. is much out of the way, and the truth is, neither in, nor with him; for where it could distinguish between *Paul*, as after the flesh, and as after the spirit in the same time, in his flesh in bondage, and in his mind free, and waiting for the deliverance of his body too in due time, both from sins and sufferings: But how can he distinguish such things, that could not distinguish things nearer hand? But whereas I said, I was able in the strength of God to worry such Foxes as he, that is to baffle and confound them; as I also actually was helpt to do, yet because I say, after that people see I was weary and spent, he vapors as if I was not therefore in the strength of God, forgetting that of the Apostle, that at the same time in different respects, a man may be strong and weak both; when I am weak, then am I strong; and, I was among you in weakenesse, yet my speech was in the demonstration of the spirit and power, 1 Cor. 2. 3, 4. Surely when I said I was able to worry him, in the strength of the Lord, I did not say, or signifie, nor could any, of the people I suppose so apprehend me, that I was able to beat him at handcuffs, or had stronger Lungs then he, but that I was able, by the power of the truth, to make manifest his deceipts: which also God gave me bodily strength to do, so as to the satisfaction of the indifferent auditory, and had I needed more to that, I question not but he would have given it me: He that cannot distinguish spiritual strength from bodily, how should he distinguish between *Pauls* state after the spirit, and his state at the same time after the flesh? As a man in the flesh, warring yet against sin, and wishing for deliverance (for that's the force of that phrase (who will deliver?)) as *Deut.* 5. 29. according to the *Hebrew*, who will give them an heart to fear me? argues not that the Lord was ignorant, or doubted who would, but an earnest desire that they had such an heart) but in the same time he thanked God by Jesus Christ. *Rom.* 7. 24, 25. and so *Paul* was free in his spirit and more than a conqueror in all his sufferings, though Christ who dwelt in his heart by faith (though I never read what G. W. intimates that Christ was in *Pauls* flesh, though therein, and therethrough he might manifest his power and virtues) but as to his body that was not above prison and weakenesse and death, even so, neither was his flesh free from sin being in it, though his spirit was set free and above it.

Paul (saith he) made himselfe a servant to all, that he might gain the more, and became a Jew to the Jew, and weak to the weak. True, in his use of indifferent things, such as meats, drinks, wages, &c. But he became not a Jew to the Jew, in not believing or confessing Jesus to be the Christ, and though to those that being weak in the Faith, doubted of their liberty to some such outward things as before mentioned; he also abstained from the use of his freedome to them, not telling them of his liberty, lest he should offend them; but in those things, having his faith to himselfe, as if he also was weak, as he advises others, Rom. 14. 22. 1 Cor. 10. 28, 29. Yet it's evident that was not the case here. For to what purpose should he pretend, in some places to be in such states, & in other places of the same Epistle, to the same people, express himselfe to be far above such states, as G. W. saies he did, in saying, he was at peace with God, &c. So that these appear (as indeed they are) silly shifts of G. W. to hide the nakednesse of his assertion and corruption of his judgement; but they will not do it. As for his personal accusations of us, as uncivil, and bawling and wrangling, and desiring to tie him up to Tea and Nay, they are vain and false accusations, and so I shall passe them; As also his after insinuations of rantings, and loves amongst us, and of a woman set up for a Teacher by us, (when of any woman set up to teach by us, I know none: who turned Ranters is known; so be some of their lusts, &c.) as also his charging me, as speaking of G. Rose as a distracted man, and yet bringing his words against them, when as I said but, that the people heard him begin at a distance like a kind of distracted man, to call out, not that I counted him a distracted man; these personal and untrue reflections, I say I passe as impertinencies. And as for his saying, *We would not suffer him to read in our Book, and yet we read out of theirs*, and his vain and false insinuations therefrom, the ridiculousnesse thereof is sufficiently cleared in the relation of our discourse, though he take no more notice of it, than if no such thing had been mentioned. His asking questions, when he should have answered, were meer diviations from our businesse; and yet I know of none that I answered not then, except that [what death came in by sin] which he sought in subtilty, as I conceived, to put me upon, that he might wind out from the thing, that puzzled him. As for his feeling the power of God over us] He might feel it over us indeed, to protect us, and inable us to baffle him, for which we blesse the Lord, but otherwise it appeared not with him, in his answers, nor yet appeareth with him, in what he hath written in his own vindication. He saies, *The Apostles wept with them that wept, and waite for the Redemption of the body where it was not redeemed; as he travelled for the Gallatians, &c.* Which are nothing to the purpose, for a man may weep with those that weep, without saying falsely, that he is exercised with the same trials in himselfe, and of his own, as others weep under: Cannot I weep with such as weep for the absence of Gods spirit from them, or for the losse of some neer relation, unlesse I say, I am in the same condition

tion with them. Nay, if I say its so with me, as with them, then do I not shew such charity to them; for then it may rather be judged, that I weep for my own afflictions, than with them for theirs, one saying of the Apostle any where, that his body was already redeemed from that bondage, the redemption of it from which he there saies, he waited for, were more than and hundred such shifts, his proofs alleadged in our discourse, from *Rom. 8. 2. 2 Cor. 13. 8.* He was then so answered to, and beaten from that, he hath here passed them over, as not able to relieve him. For the Apostles travelling for the *Galatians*; as I remember in the dispute, he disclaimed it then, for making for his purpose when T. M. was answering him to it, thinking he had had some reference to it, in what he spake about *Pauls* travelling, and that, its not to his purpose is evident, because the Apostle saies not there, as in the other place of the *Romans*, that he waited or travelled for the redemption of his own body, no, nor for the redemption of their bodies, but till Christ was formed in them, not coupling in himselfe together with them as condescending in such a manner to their states.

Setting down two or three of my questions, together without his answer to them, he then taxes me for omitting the word (bondage) in speaking of the redemption of the body, which word he saies he used, a great matter, is it not, when as the very word redemption implies some bondage to be redeemed from, nor doth the Apostle use the word, Bondage, in speaking of the redemption of their body, the creatures groaning to be delivered, and the Saints waiting for the redemption of the body we before shewed (at the dispute also) to be distinct things and not the same.

He saies here again, *That the Saints had that redemption of the body from the bondage of corruption, when the creatures were delivered into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God before their decease.* But he proves it not, nor could do at the dispute; 'tis proofs we looke for, and not bare assertions upon his own authority, which without proof from Scriptures, weighs with us nothing. The Scripture neither saies, that the creatures had the deliverance into the liberty of the Sons of God, nor that the Saints had the redemption of their body before their decease, but speaks of both as things future, and therefore groaned and waited for, see else, *Rom. 8. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.* And indeed they could not be before those Saints deceased, for evident it is that the Apostle (*ver. 17. 18.*) speaks about their sufferings with Christ, and reigning with Christ, and speaks of the sufferings with him; as first, and the Reigne, as a thing afterward; the sufferings are of this present time, or life, but the glory is to be after revealed, and therefore spoken of as in the future, to this present time, [shall be revealed in or upon us] and about that glory and revelation of it, and the redemption of the body from the sufferings that go before it speaks, *ver. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.* Now seeing the glory could not be revealed nor the redemption of the body (from the sufferings) be before the sufferings be accomplished, and their suffer-

sufferings (even the sufferings of the present time) were to bodily Death, therefore it followes, that the redemption of the body from the bondage it was under, in, and by those sufferings could not be till after their decease, except the Redemption be before the bondage, and the glory thereof before the sufferings, contrary to the Apostles order, in speaking of them; which one consideration to those that can and will see, may suffice to shew, that it's no error or absurdity in me (as G. W. after reckons it) to say, that the corruption which Paul waited and groaned for, the Redemption of his body from, is the corruption of mortality (in part) though he hath belyed me, by his addition, in saying, as part of my assertion [in which the body is in death, when it is in corruption] for I had no such non-sensical expression.

That the Apostles waited for the Redemption of the body from all the bondage and misery that the sufferings of this time, or life could bring it to, and so from bondage to death and grave also, and in that hope and expectation, yielded up their bodies to sufferings for Christs sake, is evident in the Scriptures. It was the hope of the Resurrection even of that resurrection of the dead, in which, what is sown in Corruption, is raised in Incorruption, that led them into Jeopardies, & to fight with Beasts after the manner of men, 1 Cor. 15. 30, 32, 42, 53. & that made them speak, though death therethrough wrought in them, 1 Cor. 4. 12, 13, 14. Oh how wicked and corrupt concerning the faith, are these men that deride the looking for, and hope of that Redemption of the body, because a thing so many hundreds of yeares off! as if because so far off, therefore they did not look for it: Whenas the Fathers that died in the Faith, and received not, as then, the promises, lived many hundred yeares before the Apostles, and yet they saw these promises a far off, and imbraced them, and confessed themselves strangers and Pilgrims in hope and expectation of a City and Country prepared for them, in the receipt of which they shall not be perfect without us believers of these last ages. Now what they hoped for they waited for too; For if we hope for what we see not, then do we with expectation wait for it, saith the Apostle, Rom. 8. 24, 25. And if they (the Fathers) hoped and waited, and yet wait, for the Redemption of their body in the resurrection of it, might not the Apostles much more, to whom it was by many hundreds of yeares nearer? or is it more absurd to say Paul hath not yet the Redemption of the body for which he waited, then that Abraham hath not yet received all the promises for which he hoped? or that either of their bodies are not yet raised, nor that glorious appearance of Christ yet come, in which they are to be raised? Their expectation of which, while here, led them to deny ungodlinesse and worldly lusts; Tit. 2. 12, 13, 14. But it appears plainly ~~that~~ G. W.'s deriding such an expectation, that he expects and waits for, nor groans after no such thing, whatsoever he subtilly say after that, ver. 13, 14, 16. of 1 Thes. 4. he never denied nor doubted of, and so slighted disput-

Heb. 11. 13,
14, 15, 39, 40.

putting about it, no, no, he was not willing to open his corrupt sense too broadly about them, as may after appear.

He saies, *Paul groaned not to be unclothed, but clothed upon*; True, it was not death he groaned for, but to be clothed upon with his house from heaven, which because they knew they could not be clothed with, till the earthly house of this Tabernacle were dissolved, therefore they were willing rather to be absent from the Body, 2 Cor. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. But if *Paul*, when he wrote that Epistle, groaned for that redemption of the body, which he saies he groaned for when he writ to the Romans, (as G. W. also implies, by his quoting that place to parallel the other, as indeed it doth) then why did G. W. at the dispute endeavour to prove, that the Apostle had that Redemption of the body when he writ this Epistle, because he saies therein, *Chap. 13. 8. he could do nothing against the truth, but for the truth*? Thinks he, that *Paul* received that Redemption of the body, between his writing, what is in *Chap. 5.* and what is writ in *Chap. 13*? Surely such a change would have made him some where, in the very writing, break forth into an extraordinary Triumph, more than we find him therein, between the said passages to do. Indeed *Chap. 12.* he tells us, of being taken up into Paradise, and of abundance of Revelations, but whether in the body, or not, he knew not; and besides, he speaks of things above 14 yeares before, and sure he was not so long writing that Epistle, or did G. W. rather wittingly, bring that saying, to blind and deceive people? That appears most likely, and so that he is a Deceiver indeed, and to be therefore counted accursed. 'Tis true, *that Paul calls that Redemption of the body, the Adoption, and Christ was made under the Law, to Redeem those that were under the Law, that they might receive the Adoption of Sons;*] and that Adoption the Apostle had received in his spirit, when he said he waited for the Adoption, the Redemption of his body, for in *Rom. 8. 15, 16.* he saies, even of them he wrote to (and therefore their state was not a state below being Sons of God, and to be born of God) *Ye have received the Spirit of Adoption, whereby we cry abba Father, and the spirit it self beareth witnesse with our spirits, that we are the children of God.* And therefore surely born of God, though yet they waited for that Adoption, the Redemption of the body, ver. 23. So that still the more G. struggles, the more he is proved a deceiver, and my charge appears made good against him, and no ly for me to say so. Nor need to prove, that the Prophets and Apostles had sin in them, and were sinners so long as they lived (though that also was done from *Psal. 143. 2.* as before) it's enough that they confesse sin in them, and waited for the Redemption of the body, after they were born of God, which was the thing that G. denied. Nor need I prove that the Quakers preach themselves free from sin, seeing they grant (or deny not) that charge against them in their answer to our first Book. Nor will their having confessed their sins serve the turne, as was shewed at the beginning; though yet G. W. is here covering and

and pleading for his sins or errors, as it is apparent, so the Apostles did not, much lesse need we prove that they, *preach themselves perfect, as if their preaching made them perfect*] for no body ever charged them with such a thing in that sense. It's enough, that they preach themselves to be so perfect, as that they have no sin, for which they need Christ to be their Propitiation.

See again Reader, how George is put to his shifts about *Asc.* *It is not said* (saith he) *that his heart was perfect all his life-time*, [as if all his daies (to wit, of his reigne) did not last to the end of his life, had he a life time after all his daies were ended? If he lived some daies after his heart ceased to be perfect, then was not his heart perfect all his daies, and then the Scripture saith not truly, shall we believe the Scriptures or G. W's, glosse? *That his heart was perfect all the while he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, And while the Land was quiet under his reigne, but not after.* That is a glosse of his own brain, against the authority of the Text, seeing that time was not all his daies, nor is it said, his worke was perfect all his daies, but his heart; and that might be perfect, as to his owning no god but the true God, and desiring to approve it selfe to him, notwithstanding some rash passions, and neglect in seeking to him for a time, as well as it is said to have been perfect, notwithstanding the high places were not removed, 1 Kings 15. 14. As some Kings whose worke were perfecter did, & as he also should have done, had his worke been perfect and sinlesse. But wee see, both by what he saies to this and other Scriptures before mentioned, George makes no great matter of juggling his authority with the authority of the Scriptures, which evidences him to be a dangerous fellow, not to be listened to. View we his endeavours, to vindicate his corrupt sayings about the coming of Christ, mentioned, 1 Thes. 4. 15. 16. to which coming they said in their Book, the Saints that were then alive remained. He saies, *I wrested their words, and made a false construction of them, contrary to the end and intent of them; for what they said* (he saith) *was against our imaginations, who look* (he saies) *carnally for the coming of Christ, as many of the World do, of whom Christ said, I go away and the world seeth me no more.* John 14.

Ans. That I wrested not his words, let their words and mine, being compared, witness. They said, as for that, 1 Thes. 4. 15. (our quotation they answered to, was 1 Thes. 4. 15. 16. concerning the coming of the Lord from heaven (which phrase is v. 16. not the 15th. though they both speak of the same coming) that coming of Christ the Saints that were then alive remained to it. Now from that I inferred, that if they remained so, that coming, wherein they that were found alive, shall not prevent them that sleep, then they remained to that coming, in which the dead in Christ (even the dead bodies of the Saints that sleep in such sense as it's said, that Stephen fell asleep when he dyed, shall be raised, and the living changed, &c.) Now let the Reader read 1 Thes. 4. 15. 16. and see if that doth not necessarily follow; and whither that be not the coming of the Lord there spoken to, to which

that phrase [we that live and remain] is coupled, in verse 15, 16, and 17. So that if the Apostles and Saints then living, did remain to the coming of Christ from Heaven there spoken of, (as they said) then did they remain till his coming with a shout, and the voice of the Archangel, and the dead in Christ being raised, as is evident; And I did not wrest their words besides the drift of them, only they meant not indeed, that they lived to the Resurrection of the dead bodies of the Saints (though of that the Apostle here speaks) because they believe no such thing, but undermine it as I charged them. *That we carnally look for the coming of Christ, as many of the world do*] is not only their reproof of us, but an intimate blaspheming of the truth, for we expressed no other looking for the coming of Christ from Heaven, but that spoken to in *1 Thes. 4. 13, 16. Philip. 3. 21.* which here they reproach as an imagination of ours, as carnally looking for him; as if it was but a carnal imagination, to think that Christ shall ever so descend, and come in like manner from heaven, as the Disciples see him go up into heaven, that is, visibly and bodily, by which reproach they are more made manifest to be Deceivers, and such as ought to be accounted accursed by us, as underminers of the hope of the Gospel, nor doth Christ say in *John 14.* as G. secretly implies, that the world shall see him no more, he shall come no more visibly to them, but the world (after a little while) seeth me no more, or not yet (*οὐ βλεψήσιν*) it is in the present time, seeth me not yet, or no more, because he is now only to be seen in the Spirit by faith, whilst he is in bodily absence, and the world hath not that faith by which to see him.

He saith, *He vindicated those words of theirs, and witnessed to the several comings of Christ, as he was revealed to the Saints, from glory, to glory*] How he vindicated their words, both the relation of our discourse (which he confirms herein to be true, and that he had no cause to fault me, for saying his answers were to that purpose, as I have related them (which I added because I did not pretend to, nor could I relate every word of his answer, with all the circumstances, tautologies and circumlocutions of them) for to the same purpose as he here expresses I related) and what he saith here shews: unlesse by (vindicting their words) he mean (as a distinct thing, from witnessing to the several comings of Christ, as he was revealed to the Saints, &c.) what he alledged from the next Chapter about sleeping, and from *Jo. 5. 25.* about the dead hearing the voice of the Son of God, and from *1 Thes. 1. 10.* Of the *Thessalonians* waiting from the coming of Christ from Heaven; and then also, he both confirms my relation, that mentions those answers, before his talking of the several degrees of Christs revealing himself to the Saints, and to that he falsly cavils afterward, when he saies, that, in pag. 11. *I lay down many words that he never spake*] for there are not many words of his laid down in that page, as the Reader thereof may see, and what is laid down as his, I dare call God; and the Auditory to witness I have not wronged him

in,

in, yea and he himself in this answer, acknowledges divers of them, and also how forrily he vindicated their words, or rather how grossly he prevaricated instead of vindicating them, alledging the sleeping in security, against which the Apostle warnes them, *1 Thes. 5. 6.* as an interpretation of the sleeping in Jesus, about which in, *1 Thes. 4. 13, 14, 15.* he comforts them; and the raising the dead in sins, *1 Job. 3. 25.* as answering to the rising of the dead in Christ, *1 Thes. 4. 16.* and the coming of Christ from Heaven, which the believing *Thessalonians* that had turned from dumb Idols waited for, as all one with that efficacy of the voice of Christ, causing the dead in sins to hear, and hearing, to live, spoken of *John 5. 25.* Such a vindication of their words, was but a more evident manifestation of their ignorance and corruption.

He adds, that he, *Never denyed the coming of the Lord from Heaven, when he shall bring with him, them that sleep in Jesus, and raise the dead in Christ, nor ever said, that that was already over and past.* As he saies *I belyed him.* That he in so many expresse words, denyed the coming of Christ from Heaven, when he shall bring with him them that sleep, I never charged him; nor did he ever confesse that coming, & that bringing with him them that sleep in him, and raising the dead in Christ, the Apostle there speaks of, but undermines it, while he saies, that the Saints then alive remained to it: And calls our expecting it, but an Imagination of ours, and a carnal looking for him, yea, and though he did not in expresse words directly say it is over and past, yet his saying the Saints then alive (namely when the Apostle so wrote) remained to it, clearly implies it, for it is not remained a word of the time past, he said not, they do or shall remain to it, but remained in the time past and over. Thinks he we cannot understand words, when we hear them? But he intimates his crafty meaning, in saying he never said, that was already over and past, a few line after. When he saies, *What confusion would I charge upon them* (and is that a strange thing to find them in confusion) *as to say, the coming of Christ, at which, the dead in him are to be raised, is already past and over, as if that which is yet to be, is over and past.*

See here, the sence in which G. W. never said, that coming of Christ, is over and past, not that that coming of Christ there spoken of, *1 Thes. 4. 15, 16.* Is over and past to the Apostles and Saints of that age; To them Christ came, and the dead in him were raised, and they, the then living Saints, were changed, and all caught up together to meete him in the ayre; This G. denies not to be their meaning; nay he implies it to be their mind, in his next words. *viz. That with that non-sence I might as well have charged the Saints as them, who remained, unto the coming of the Lord, and yet did not prevent them, which were asleepe from being raised, in which (besides other corruptions, which I may by and by mention) he asserts that those Saints, did remaine to that coming of the Lord, mentioned, 1 Thes. 4. 15, 17. that*
not

nor the thing he ever said was over and past, *vix.* That coming of the Lord to those Saints; but in this sence, he never said it, *vix.* That as it is to come yet, or yet to be (as he implies the same, or like coming is to come in these and following ages.) so he never said it was over and past, for that's nonsense, to say, what shall be, is past. Minde then Reader, what corruption of mind he here implies, namely that, that coming of Christ there spoken of, is not to be, to all dead and living Saints at once, even to all that dyed and lived in their several ages, together with those of us (that is, of the body of believers, all which, in all ages, the Apostle speaks there of, as of one society or body, as in mine answers I cleared, that to be the sence of the Apostles) that shall then be found living, and remaining to it; But that that coming of Christ was to the Saints in that age, and is to the Saints in every age; but if so, then I would know what Saints did not live and remain to that coming, if he come to the Saints in every age, do any Saints dye before he come, and not remain to it, as the Apostle implies distinguishing the living and remaining, from them that sleep and are dead in Christ? If some dyed before his coming to the living, did those dead Saints rise at his coming to those living ones in every age? If so, then they make a Resurrection of the dead, even the dead in body, in every age, or continually, and yet that which was corruptable in them, never puts on incorruptoin, but lies and Rots, for their corruptable bodies lye yet in their Sepulchres, as it's said of *David* after many generations. But if the dead Saints rise not again, in every age when Christ comes to the living, then how do not the living Saints prevent those that are asleep? Why, for that G. W. finds out a new devise to save that matter, while he ads of his own head, they prevent them not from rising, but those words (from rising) are his own, not in the Text, nor doth the word (*prevent*) signifie such a thing there, as to hinder or keep from a thing, as G. W. ignorantly implies; but the sence is, we shal not be before them. The living Saints shal not be in their glory before those, which are dead, even as to their bodies, and so the word (*prevent*) that comes of *prevenire*, signifies in *Psal.* 88. 13. and 119, 147, 148. and else where.

He saies, *Wheribc urged the Apostles remaining till the coming of the Lord, as in 1 Thes. 4. 15, 17. I to render him odious* (nay to discover his deceits) *urged, ver. 13, 14, 16. which he saies, he never denied, nor doubted of her.* And so he lighred disputing about it, though I would make it disputable, as if all those verses spake not of the same coming of Christ; or as if the word, *then*, (then we which are alive, and remain, ver. 17.) did not clearly relate to the coming with a shout, and the dead in Christ rising, spoken of in ver. 16. And as if he slighted and waved disputing about those verses, and yet mentioned the sleeping, spoken of in *Chap. 5. 6.* and the dead living by the voice of Christ, 1 *John 5. 25.* With evident reference to what I urged from *ver. 13, 14, 15.* where those phrases of sleeping, and dead in Christ are men-

tioned

cloned; thus we see Foxes have their holes to creep into when persued by the truth; but these do but slenderly hide his deceit. He grants, his mention of *John 5. 25.* touching the dead hearing the voice of the Son of God, and what occasion had he to mention that, if he slighted disputing about the 16. verse, where the dead being raised, is mentioned? He hath a starting hole, such as it is, for that too; For he saies, *That these that were dead, or asleep, in their sins, might come to be raised out of them, and live.* This he saies, *He knew was the most needful for many people that heard us, to know, they having such as I for their Teachers, whose Ministry (he slanderously saith) doth greatly tend to keep men in their sins, when we so much strive for sin, in contending and pleading for it, as I have done.* Ah shameful subterfuge! canst thou not smell a Fox hear, Reader? Historians say, when they are closely persued, they sting about their pisse with their tails to annoy their persuers with its stench, and so doth G. W. here; For is it likely he would run from vindicating himself against my charge, and clearing himself of the guilt of it (which had been the best course to bring people off from listening to my Ministry, and to have attended to theirs, in which he supposes the voice of Christ may be better met with to raise them from their sins) to mention a Scripture as paralleling the rising of the dead in Christ, which is quite to another purpose, and so to give me advantage against him, to make all the people see his weaknesse and impertinency, and inability to defend himself against my charge? Was his bare mentioning that Scripture and waving it againe, when I shewed its impertinency, the way to raise them out of their sins, that were a sleep in them? Or was that the voice of the Son of man, that the dead hear? Oh sorry man and hard put to it, that is forced to devise such sorry shifts to hide himselfe in; and what would he do if he had not that slander at his tongues end (that we plead for sin, and that our Ministry tends to keep people in it) which reflects upon the Apostles equally with us, as I have before shewed?

Surely a great part of his Books are usually made up with the repeating of that senselesse reproach. For surely our Preaching the Doctrines of the Resurrection and the judgement to come, more directly tend to awake people out of sins; yea, our telling them that they have sin in them to watch against, then their corrupt denyals and underminings of those doctrines do. Thus I have further made good my charge in vindicating my managment of it from his cavils thereagainst, in the main things objected by him. The rest are more trivial, and a shorter touch will serve to overthrow them, as his charging me with, *A disssembling imitation, in saying I appealed to that of God, in all the people when he saies, I deny that all have the light of Christ in them, which is that of God they speak of, and appeal to in all.* How silly is this, For had we all men before us to speak to? Or if the light of Christ was in all them, follows it, that it is in all the infants and Reprobates in the world? Or if, when they appeal to that of God in all, they mean it, of the light
of

of Christ (namely his spiritual light, which only I deny to be in all at all times.) followes it that I must do so to; Is there nothing of God in men besides that spiritual light? Is not the soul, the understanding faculty, and the reason, of God? and is that the light of Christ, they speak of, as brought forth in some to be the Prince of peace? So his taxing, *My laughing at them, as not ministering grace to the people, but stirring up folly and madnesse.* What? coth not the laughing of the just to see their enemies defeated, as *Psa. 52. 6.* minister grace to the hearers? might not my expressing my joy in the Lord, for his goodnesse in strengthening and helping me against such a Bravado, that brag of what they were and could do, provoke the people to seek to know the truth of, and trust in that God whom they see after solemn appeals to him, before them, and desire to manifest his truth, and stop the mouth of error, so to baffle him by his poor weak servant? Surely it might.

Whereas I said, and proved from *Col. 2. 10.* with 3, 5, 8. That men compleat in Christ, may yet have sins in themselves to mortifie, he turns & perverts my saying shamefully, when he saies, *The Apostle said not those that were in fornication and uncleannesse, &c. were compleat in Christ, for those that were compleat in Christ had put off all these]*

Ans. Nor said I, those that are in fornication and uncleannesse are compleat in Christ. Is G. so simple as not to discern a large difference, between sins being in men, and men being in those sins! as much as between mens having unclean humors, as of blood or excrements in them, and their being in uncleannesse by the issuing of them upon them, as was noted before. I said not men that are in those evils, but that have such evils in them to mortifie, may yet be compleat in Christ, and that the Scripture above quoted clearly proves, nor doth that hinder that G. W. alledges. *viz. That those that are compleat in Christ have put off those things;* for those that have put them off, are bid to put them off still, See else *Col. 8. 3.* But now you also put off all these things, Anger, Wrath, &c. Seeing that you have put off the old man with his deeds. They had put the old man off, and yet are bid to put them off, because they are not perfectly put off at once, so as no need of putting them off any more. So *1. Cor. 5. 7.* They that are said to be unleavened, are yet bid to purge out the old leaven. As a Wife in taking an Husband yeilds up her selfe to be his, and puts off her will, or power over her selfe, and yet needs dayly to be exercising herselfe therein to put off and deny her will. George saies, *The members could not remain, where the body on which they were, were put off.* Shall we believe Georges reason, or the Apostles saying? Sure tis Georges ignorance and error that he cannot apprehend (or else his worse minde, to deceive people that he will not own) the things of God. They seem foolishnesse to him, that a man may be compleat in Christ, and yet have sins in him to mortifie. And because he cannot comprehend them (and how should he, when he is so far out about the faith of the person

person of Christ and believes not in him, but in an internal principle only in himself and others?) he endeavours to render them foolishnesse to others also, and sticks not to oppose his sayings to the Apostles, and to invent glosses and shifts, as if the Apostles said not those things to the same persons, but to persons in different states. And whereas I replied, did the Apostle write one Chapter, to one part of the people, and another Chapter, to another part of them? He saies, *I manifest my blindness, because the Epistle was not then divided into Chapters.*

And he manifests his cavilling minde in so saying, For, what if the Epistle was not divided by him into Chapters, as I know it was not? there is the lesse colour for him to say, that those things in *Chap. 2. 19.* according to our now division of it, were writ to people in one State, & those in *Chap. 3. 5, 8.* writ to people of another. His own conceit would rather imply that the Apostle had so divided his Epistle into several Chapters, to several Persons or States, than my asking him that question upon that blind shift of his.

Would *George* and the *Quakers* instead of divers states of divers Persons, consider or believe the divers and different respects or states of the same persons, they would avoid all this their error and confusion as to this point, and the controversy thereabout between us would cease. However, I propound it to the Reader, for thy usefulness, namely, That the same persons that believe, are considerable, as they are men and women, and have natural beings of Souls and Bodies, as springing from *Adam* by propagation, and so they are sinful, mortal, subject to many infirmities, and have members on earth to mortifie. And yet the same persons as they are, by the grace of God, begotten to know and believe in Christ, and are reckoned after him, have another state in him, which is not reckoned after *Adam*, and what they are in themselves; And so they are Saints, Holy, Spotlesse, compleat, & the Apostles sometimes speaks of the same persons with reference to the one consideration, and sometimes with reference to the other, as men, to keep them lowly and little in their own eyes, and to provoke them to look more diligently to Christ, and abide in him, and as in Christ to encourage them against the discouragements from selfe and world, and to provoke them to thankfulness to God, and confidence in him, and to abide in him, where it is so well with them. So the Apostle speaks indifferently of himself, *Rom. 7. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25.* And that one consideration too shews how both *Solomon*, in saying there is no man that sinneth not, and *John* in saying he that is born of God sinneth not, do both speak truly of the same persons with different respects. No man living, as he is a man from *Adam*, though a believer, but as so considered, hath sin, and sinneth; that is, doth that that is sinful, though it is not imputed to him that believeth, because his mind being renewed, consents not to it, but strives (not for it, as these men say of us) but against it: and yet as born of God and according to the sp-

rit or new man, the man that believeth and abideth in Christ, sins nor, nor can sin, commit or consent to the sin that is and remaineth in his flesh and members, and is there to be put off yet and mortified by him.

He saies, *Many saw the truth over me.* Yes over me, as my defence and Protection, I believe they did, and error under my feet. But none that saw things rightly, could see truth with them, nor what they erroneously call truth, damping or confusing me, for then could I noe have laughed (as he saies) or rejoiced over them. As for what peace they had in the truth, may be conjectured from their want of honesty and truth in all hitherto discovered, and I shall not need to grudge them their Peace, but wish them more truth, that their peace may be therein, and not in deceit. As for his coming alone into the Congregation, that may be; and yet it may be truly said, his friends came thither with him, as the word *with* signifies a consent with him in their coming also, even as though Christ was buried alone, before the believers now living were born into the world, yet they may be said to be buried with him, as those, *Col. 2. 12.* My discovery of his deceitful abuse of *Psal. 103. 1.* he wisely passes over; I hope he is ashamed of it, that he neither at his coming then, or now, hath a word to justify himselfe therein. *That I would encourage those in power to persecute him, and to cause the outward man to suffer,* followes not from my saying, that they (namely, those of them amongst us where he hath been proved a Deceiver) should do well, not to suffer him to speak his pretended words from the Lord, except he recant his errors, no more than our Saviour encouraged the Church of *Thyatira* to persecute *Jezabel* in reproving the Angel thereof, for suffering her to teach, & to seduce the people. *Rev. 2. 20.* and in such waies as he ought not to have suffered *Jezabel* to teach and seduce, in the like way persons in power hinder G. W. or any that are proved to be deceivers without persecution of their bodies, except that was persecution Christ approved; no more doth it follow, that we are such, by our own confession, as have not the Seal of God upon our foreheads, because we say they (the *Quakers*) are a heavy judgement of God to us in this Nation, and are like the Locusts out of the bottomlesse Pit, for it is not said that the Locusts were a judgement or tryal, to none that had the Seal of God in their foreheads, but that they should not hurt them. And, I trow, the house of God is not hurt by the judgement of God that begins there, nor are we hurt by the *Quakers*; though they be troublesome, yet by occasion of that trouble, blessed be the Lord we have got good: they being made as means to provoke us to exercise our selves more to look to God, and by contending for his truth against them, to grow more clear and confident therein. As for his boasts of their borders enlarged. See what is said of the false Prophets; *many shall follow their pernicious ways,* 2 Pet. 2. 2. All they in *Asia* turned away from Paul 2 Tim. 1. 15. They were never the better for that, nor the multitude

of followers, but the truth of the Doctrine is to be regarded.

But above all, Reader, see and admire, that a man should be so infatuated or blinded with malice as this G. W. appears to be, in his cavilling against the words of the Holy Ghost quoted by me, from *Psal. 63* 10. Which he repeats as my words thus. I. H. sayth, The King Christ shall rejoice in God, every one that sweareth by him shall glory, &c.

To which he saies, *If every one that swears by Christ shall glory, then must the drunkards and Lyars and all such prophane persons as swear by him glory: And so this Doctrine, (mark this doctrine) which is the Doctrine of the Scripture, and only quoted by me, & with an explication of the word swear too, according to the language of the new Testament, for I said every one that sweareth or confesseth, which he wilfully overlooked. This Doctrine (saies he,) tends to the encouraging of drunkards, and prophane persons in swearing, which is against the doctrine of Christ, which is against the Oathes and swearing which was under the Law, &c.* What may we think of such a pittifull man as this, that shames not thus to revile the Scripture sayings? What, would he not have those words Printed or read? would he take away those Scriptures for fear the Prophane should abuse them? Nay, ought they not to be taken away, (as I have heard it said of some of them, that they reject the Bible, and say it's good for nothing, or fit to be burnt, or the like,) if the Doctrine contained in the Psalmes and Prophets tend to incourage drunkards and Prophane persons in their swearing, and be contrary to the Doctrine of Christ? If this be not a desperate deceiver, that durst thus revile and blaspheme the very words of Scripture, and a man bitterly malicious, that the better to colour over his charge of me therein, witholds ~~and~~ ^{and} overlook my explication of the word swearing, by the word confessing (as it's explicated in *Rom. 14. 11.* and *Philip. 2. 11.* with *Isa. 45. 23.*) and so a man not to be listened to, but to be accounted accursed, I know not who is: I might also note his errors, in implying, the Disciples were taught by Christ to call God Father, as he is Creator, and not as born of God, and that some thing in the Disciples, but not the Disciples themselves called Father, but they praying, in that, received what forgiveness they asked, but it seems were not to aske that dayly as they did their bread, for when they received what they asked, then they had to more sin, nor need to pray for forgiveness: And so he implies, that before they were born of God, or could by the Holy Ghost call Father, before the Birth was brought forth in them, they might pray for forgiveness; ~~as~~ when our Saviour taught them to call God Father, and yet to pray for forgiveness. A deal of such confused Babylonish stuffe George is full of.

Again in asking, *Why Christ should teach his to pray that his will may be perfectly done in Earth, as it is in Heaven, if it be not in this world to be done.* He implies there is nothing to be prayed for, but what is here to be enjoyed in this world, and so would exclude the coming of Christ

in glory, and his glorious Kingdome out of our Prayers, for that is in the world to come. But sure that world is neither in G. W's. Faith nor hope, and how should it be in his Prayers, nor is that the end with him of preaching and praying, seeing he implies that if it be not to be had in this world, *It's against the end for which the Disciples of Christ prayed as he taught them.* His calling me, *Scornful tempter and blind unbeliever,* for saying, if the Quakers have no sin in them, let them manifest it by living without bread. I passe as proceeding from his Gall, and tell him there is difference between Christs and other mens cases. He was made under infirmities for our sins sake, but if any of us have no sin, I know no reason why we should be infirme, nor find I any thing from Christ, that implies men shall need to pray for dayly bread longer than for forgivenesse of and keeping from sin; yea even then when the Disciples are come to that perfect charity, as to make their own forgivenesse of others, a rule after which they desire God to forgive, yet they are willed yet to aske forgivenesse of God, and that is a state above G. W's. who is ever and anon at his bitter words, and reproaches, as the Reader of him may see.

His asking, *How men may be kept from sin, if they may not be kept from it, according to me?* Intimately charges a lye upon me, or discovers great ignorance and deceit in him. *David* was kept from his iniquitie, yet he calls it his iniquity, a man that hath sin in him may be kept from its getting dominion over him, as *David* implies, *Psal. 19. 12, 13.* And from committing it, or consenting to it, as *Paul* was, when he saith, it was no more he that did it, but sin that dwelt in him. That *Their roote is rottennesse though they be appointed as a judgement,* is as understandable as that the *Caldeans* were wicked and unholy, and yet ordained for judgement of God; And as their being unholy hindred not the holynesse of Gods Judgement, so neither doth the rottenness of these mens roots at all reflect upon the soundnesse of Gods judgements, seeing he makes use of wicked men, whose roots are rottennesse, to be for his rods and judgements. Lastly, to his casting the lye upon me, in what I related of their uncivil and impudent posting me up, as going away to avoid them, because he saies, those words were not in it. I answer, what if those very expresse words were not in it? things may be couched in expressions, where the very same words are not expressly mentioned, as the Doctrine of the Resurrection of Christ shewed to be in *Moses* doctrine, though the word Resurrection is not expressed therein: their words in what they posted, were thus. *This is to give notice that the said I. H. was lawfully called* (which was false, for a call to break promise was not lawfull) *by the Q. whom he so accused, so publicly to prove, if he could, what he so promised, and that he had sufficient notice, being three daies aforehand of the time, wherein we desired to meet him,* (wherein also their falsehood and wickednesse appears. Their falsehood, for I had notice but the day before they came, whereas I was to have notice two or three daies before that. Their wickednesse, in that it appears

peares, they would have tyed me to have met them on the Saturday, which I knew must have been on purpose to spend me, that I might have been disabled from preaching the following day. But in stead of performing his promise (mind) against the *Q.* he the said I. H. went out of the Town, and so hath not performed his promise against the *Q.* (which is false, for I did not promise to do it at their next coming, but expressly excepted against it, because of my fore-ingaged journey) neither can be. And a little after, they say, *People hereby may discern the deceit of these men, how having spread many rayling and false accusations against the Q. when they are tryed, have refused to meet us publicly.* Now Reader, compare these shameful falities, and see if they amount to lesse than an impudent suggestion, that I went out of Town, to refuse making good my charge; which that I have made good through the strength of God, both my former relation and this vindication of it clearly testify. What they note as lies in me, stand firme for truths, both as to my assertions, so far as asserted by me, without his alterations, and as to my charges of them, as is made manifest, and George and the *Quakers* are found clearly to be the Deceivers and Lyers, as in these following particulars, amongst others, in saying or implying.

1. That I have not proved my charge, but bragged of a victory where was none.
2. That they come as the Apostles, because they have confessed sins, though now they do not as they (the Apostles) did, when Apostles.
3. That they (the *Quakers*) have forsaken their sins, yet they are found in lies and bitterness.
4. That the judgements of God are such (as his judgements) as the nature of the things or persons that be used by him as Judgements.
5. That *David* boasted of sinlesnesse in him, where he calls iniquity his.
6. That they that say the Saints have sin in them, plead for sin, and so they make the Apostles and Prophets pleaders for sin.
7. That the Apostles were without sin in this world, as Christ is, contrary to their own sayings in 1 *John* 1. 8, 10. and 2. 1, 2. *Jam.* 3. 2.
8. That not whosoever believes Jesus to be the Christ, is born of God, for many, he saies, believe that are not born of God; contrary to 1 *John* 5. 1.
9. That the Apostles and Prophets when they confess sins, were not true believers, nor born of God.
10. Nor the Disciples when Christ taught them to call God Father, &c.
11. That some men living are so sinlesse in themselves, that if God should enter into judgement with them, yet they may be justified in Gods sight, contrary to *Psal.* 143. 2.

12. That

12. That *Aza's* heart was perfect all his daies, but not all his lifetime.

13. That persons of no judgement or right understanding, can affirme or deny nothing, contrary to *Jer. 4. 22.*

14. That *Christ's* coming from Heaven (spoken of *1 Thes. 4. 15, 16,* is either often in diverse ages, or else over and past already.

15. That the Redemption of the body waited for, and groaned after by the Apostles and Saints, they had it in this life, before they deceased.

16. That the Saints waited not for things to be given them many hundred years after, contrary to *Heb. 11. 13, 39, 40.*

17. That our looking for the coming of *Christ* from Heaven personally and visibly, to raise the dead Saints that are bodily dead, is but our imagination, and a carnal looking for him.

18. That the coming of *Christ* mentioned, *1 Thes. 4. 15.* is but a revelation of *Christ* to the Saints, from glory to glory.

19. That men in whom sin is, are not, or cannot be, while such, compleat in *Christ.*

20. That to have sin in men, and to be in those sins, is all one.

21. That the *63. Psalm verse 11.* tends to encourage Drunkards, and Prophane persons in swearing, which is contrary to the Doctrine of *Christ.*

These and such like be his intimations, as is before more fully shewed. The Lord deliver the Reader from such deceits, and make the folly of these men yet more evident, that poor Souls may not be snared by them. I shall adde no more to *G. W.* but leave him to the Lords convincement and silencing: Who when he sets home his reproaches to any of them, will do it to such purpose, as to stop their clamorous cavils, which they cease not to invent and raise up against us, though against our clearest confutations of them, because they be absurd and unreasonable men. The Lord exalt his Name and truth, to the rebuke and silence of their errors against him.

Queries

Queries sent by Richard Hubberthorne, to us, with our answer to them; And the like number of Queries sent by I. H. to Richard Hubberthorne, to be answered plainly by him.

Richard Hubberthorne sent these ensuing Queries to us, thus entitled.

These few Queries, grounded upon the Scriptures, concerning the resurrection of the body of Christ, I send unto you to Answer in the form of sound words, according to your Faith in the same.

1 **S**eeing the Scripture saith, no man Ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of man, which is in Heaven, with what body was the Son of man then in Heaven, when the man Christ Jesus was upon the Earth, in that body which was crucified at Jerusalem?

2. And when Christ was raised from the dead, whither might any touch him before he was Ascended to the Father, seeing he said unto Mary, touch me not, for I am not yet Ascended to my Father, but go to my brethren, and tell them I Ascend to my Father, and your Father, to my God and your God? *Job. 20. 17.*

3. And whether at the same time, did not the same Mary touch him, seeing that in *Mat. 28. 9.* it is said she met Jesus, saying, *All hail*, and held him by the feet and worshipped him?

4. Whether the two men that stood by the Sepulchre in shining garments, or white apparel, as in *Luke 24. 4.* which they both saw as men, and heard them speak, had two real individual distinct bodies, as the bodies of men; and seeing that those two men, and also Jesus is said all to appear in white Linnen or shining apparel, whether had they all bodies alike of flesh and bones, which a Spirit hath not, as *Luke 24. 39.* or they only had such bodies as a Spirit hath, without flesh and bones?

5. And how did the women distinguish which was Christ, whether by his bodily appearance, not to be like the other, or by the power of his voice, seeing they all was both seen and heard, and Mary when she first saw him, knew him not till he first spake to her, *John 20. 16.* and seeing that both the Angels and Christ, spake the same words to Mary, whereby did she distinguish?

6. Again seeing the Scripture saith, that the same women, at the same time found not the body of Christ, but returned and said, they had seen a vision of Angels, which said that he was alive, as *Luke 24. 36.* at the 23. whether was it only a vision of Angels seen invisible, or it was visible bodies or persons of men, or visible voices?

7. And seeing the Scripture saith in *Mat. 28. 7.* That they should go in Galilee, and there should see him, whether did the eleven Disciples first see him at Galilee or at Jerusalem, seeing that *Luke* saith, *Luke 24. that*

that the same day in which he did arise, he appeared in the midst of them, where the eleven were met together in *Jerusalem*, ver. 33. and *John* 20. 19. it is said, the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut Jesus stood in the midst of them? here is the eleven mentioned to be met together, and yet it is said that *Thomas* was not among them, *John* 20. 24. And after the eight daies in which he appeared to them again: Whether in all this time had he Assended to his Father and their Father, to his God and their God?

8. And whether is not all these things mystery, and cannot be seen nor known nor understood as they are, but as the Spirit doth open and reveal them?

Richard Hubbertborne

These for *John Horne* and *Thomas More* to answer.

Note here Reader, 1. That the form of sound words is according to our Faith in the Resurrection of Christ: So the Title *perfected* by him implies, and that is rightly implied, though hapily more than he intended, therein he spake truth like as *Caiaphas* did.

2. That they are not of our Faith, and so not of a sound faith about the Resurrection of the body of Christ.

3. That he saies these Queries be concerning the Resurrection of the body of Christ. And yet the first speaks of what Christ said, while he was not yet put to death, or risen from it. And in all the rest he implies his curioſity and evil designe, to render the Scriptures but a cunningly devised fable or Allegory, having no real truth in them, in what they speak about that Resurrection: and so that he believes neither it nor them according to their Testimony concerning it, but endeavours to render them, not to be regarded or believed according to their sayings, as being full of contradictions and absurdities, that so people might wave them, and learn the mystery from the *Quakers*. Such wickedness is clearly enough to those that have the eyes of their understanding opened, touched in those Queries, as the eighth more clearly implyeth.

To these Queres I *J. Horne* returned this following answer, which I also prepared for him, and had in readinesse to have sent him, upon the receipt of his answers to my eight Queries after mentioned, which seeing I have not hitherto received from him, I have now made publick, as followeth.

1. To the first I say, That the Scripture in *John* 3. 13. Doth not say, that Christ was in Heaven in his body then, and therefore that Question (in what body was the Son of man then in Heaven) is not grounded on the Scripture, *Paul* was wrapt up into the third heaven, when yet his body was upon earth. Men may be in their minds and spirits where their bodies are not, as *Col.* 2. 5. much more might Christ, who

who was also God. He as God, or the eternal Word, was then in heaven and in his Spirit ascended up to heaven, so as no man else could, even when his body was upon the Earth and not in heaven, as now it is.

2. To the second I say, some might touch Christ when he was raised from the dead, before he was ascended and taken up in his body into heaven, there to be and remain, for the confirmation of their faith in the reality of his Resurrection, though he said to *Mary*, taking hold of his feet to worship him, touch me not, for I am not yet ascended, *Mat. 28. 9.* with *John 20. 17.* For the Disciples were bid, to the end aforesaid, to handle and touch him, *Luke 24. 39. John 20. 27.*

3. To the third I say, It's probable *Mary* did at the same time touch him, and intended to worship him with Divine adoration, & that occasioned his saying to her, touch me not, even as *Cornelius* fell down at *Peter's* feet to worship him, and worshipt him, and *John* fell down to worship the Angel, and both were thereupon forbidden by them so to do, *Act. 10. 25. Rev. 19. 20.*

4. To the fourth, The two Angels that stood by the Sepulchre in shining garments, or white apparel, &c. were two Angels, and had two individual formes, but that they had bodies as the bodies of men, of the same substance with them, the Scripture saies not, nor do I believe it. Nor find I it said, that Jesus appeared to his Disciples after his Resurrection in white or shining garments, or that he and the Angels had bodies alike of flesh and bones, which a spirit hath not, nor that a spirit hath a body without flesh and bones, or a body at all otherwise then it assumes a body, or appearance of a body to appear in. And the inquiring and prying into these things about what is written argues a proud Luciferian spirit, and a man rashly puffed up with fleshly minde not holding the head, or an Atheistical deriding (and designe to undermine) the authority of the Scriptures. There is enough in what is revealed to busy ourselves about, and no need to inquire of things kept secret, as *Judg. 13. 18. Deut. 29. 29.*

5. To the fifth, That the women did distinguish which was Christ, is certain : but how they did so, is curiosity to inquire, and presumption to determine, one of the foolish and unlearned questions, which we are to avoid, *2 Tim. 2. 23.* He that could appear to them in divers forms as he pleased, could also appear in such a form, as in which they might know him, when he pleased, and in such a form when he pleased, as in which they did not know him; as to *Mary*, and the two Disciples going to *Emmaus*, or he could open their eyes to discern him, or hold them from it as he would. The like may be said for his speech, *Luke 24. 16.*

6. The sixth, The Angels, of whom the women had a vision, were seen visibly without doubt, for of seeing invisibly I have not heard, except in such a sence, as the seer be not seen again, which was not their case. Nor were those Angels bodies or persons of men, much lesse had

they visible voices, as is ignorantly and non-sensically queried. Visible voices and audible colours are both alike.

7. To the seventh, in which are several Queries, I say, 1. That the 11 Disciples saw him after his Resurrection at *Jerusalem*, before they saw him at *Galilee*, for at *Jerusalem* they saw him the same day he arose. But *Galilee* was above a daies journey thence, *Luke* 2. 44. much lesse could they, being in mortal bodies, go thither and returne again to *Jerusalem* the same day.

2. To what is said, That *Luke* 24. 33. He appeared where the 11 were met together, And yet it's said, *John* 20. 24. That *Thomas* was not there with them.

I Answer, It's clear, That *Luke* mentions together the things of two appearances to them distinctly mentioned by *John*. And yet, 2. It's not said in *Luke* that the 11 were together when he appeared, but when the two disciples returned. How knowest thou but after that, *Thomas* might be gone out before Christs appearing. 3. *Thomas* is called one of the 12. *John* 20. 24. *Matthias* was chosen into their number, and reckoned with them before the Evangelists wrote those books, though not before those appearances, it may be, and the Evangelists might speak of them according to their present account of them, when he wrote that book. And so *Thomas* (who was one of the 12 when the Evangelists wrote) being absent, there were besides him but 11 of the 12.

3. As for his Ascending to his Father, before that time; possibly he might be said in such sence, as in *John* 3. 13. to have ascended more than once; yea, frequently in his spirit, but in the most proper sence of his body going up thither, there to be contained or received till the time of restitution of all things, he was not as then ascended.

8. To the eighth, If by my story you mean, that these are not to be taken as they are spoken of, I deny it. They are a history or relation of things not now to be so done, or so seen now as then they were done and seen. Though the usefulness of them is not to be known and understood, but by the Spirits opening it to us, in his Testimony concerning him, and giving us an understanding therein. But herein the Q's corrupt judgement is seen, that they imply, that they believe not that there was ever any such things really done or seen; And so that they are very Atheistical, not believing further than their reason can comprehend, and therefore where they judge it absurd (as generally they do the truth of Christ) they turne it into a fancie, and believe nothing really as it is recorded.

Written by J. Horne,
April 19. 1660.

Eight Queries propounded to Richard Hubberthorne, by John Horne, to which his plain answer is desired, according to his real mind in them.

1. IF the believing Samaritans did know rightly, and by the Spirit of truth, that Jesus of *Nazareth*, as then come in the flesh, is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world, *John* 4. 42. and if Paul was a true Apostle and preacht the truth, when he proved that that Jesus is the very Christ. And Christ himselfe said truely, that his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed, *John* 6. 53, 54, 55. And the spirit of truth witnesseth Christ come in the flesh, 1 *John* 4. 2. How canst thou clear thy selfe of being a Deceiver and false Teacher, in saying and publishing, that Christs coming in the flesh was but a Figure?

2. What but a silly deceiver was he (G.W. in his answers to the *Cambridge Queries*) who in justification of thy said saying, alledged, that Christ was transfigured? Might it not as well by the same reason be touched, that the Apostles and Believers were but forms of men, or of godly men, because transformed in the renewing of their minds? *Rom.* 12. 1.

3. And if Christs coming in the flesh was but a figure, whether dost thou believe indeed that that Christ, or Jesus, was a reall man consisting of a real humane body and soul, that had in his body real flesh and blood, really and verily conceived in the natural womb of a corporal Virgine; A Virgine in such sense as other Virgines be before married to, or carnally known by any man, and born really of her into the world; or dost thou rather believe all those things to be only Allegorically spoken?

4. And if thou dost believe that that Jesus the very Christ was indeed a real & personal man, whether dost thou believe that he really and verily and in a real and very body of flesh dyed, and rose in the same real and very body the third day from the dead, and therein after 40 daies conversing by times with his disciples ascended or was taken up into heaven; and be those things also only figuratively to be taken?

5. And whether dost thou believe that the sufferings or dyings of that man in any such real body of flesh, and his rising again in the same body and ascending, is truly availeable to the taking away or procuring pardon for any mans sin, and obtaining blessing and salvation for men? or dost thou thy self believe to be saved from thy sin and from destruction by vertue thereof, yea, or nay?

6. Whether dost thou indeed believe, that there are any Angels or created spirits distinct from men, and what is in men, and in other visible creatures, yea, or nay?

7. And if neither the bodies of men that die, and go to the grave, shall ever be raised out of their graves to a sensible life again,

nor (as *Geo. Whitehead* implies in some questions sent us) the souls of the wicked after death shall come out of Hell again, to receive any further judgement : What if the wicked shall be raised up again after their bodily death and judged to eternal punishment, as *John* 5. 29. *Mat.* 25. 46. Is it any thing, or nothing ? and if any thing, What is it ?

8. Dost the soul of the wicked at, or after the bodily death, go to any hell in which they sustain or feel any torment ? and if so, what is the hell they go to, and are tormented in ?

I challenge thee, to return me, if thou darest, a plain and direct answer to these queries, according to the very truth and belief of thy heart, not giving revilings instead of answers, but observing,
1 *Pet.* 3. 15.

John Horne.

This was sent him *April* 19. to which I have as yet received no answer from him this fourteenth of *May*, so that I hope, his mouth is stopt with them : However for any plain positive and sober answer,

John Horne

Richard Hubberthornes Letter in answer to my Queries, is thus (which came about a month after. judge how sober & plain.

London 6th. day 4th. Mon. 1660.

John Horne.

I Have received a paper of *Queries* from thee, by which it is easily known to be thine, by thy preface of lies ; which is thy usual and accustomed manner, and marke of the beast (in all thy papers) thou saiest I am guilty of seven or eight falshoods, but dost not mention any of them ; neither dost answer my paper, which proves to the contrary : So thou being so often reproved, and yet hardens thy heart against it, so, if thou wilt be filthy, thou maist be filthy still, and if thou wilt be unconvinced, when the truth hath been so plainly and often declared unto thee, thou mayst be wicked still.

Ans. As unto thy first query, I can clear my self from being a deceiver or false Teacher in all things which I have spoken ; and can also prove thee to be a false accuser (in saying) that I said & published, that Christs coming in the flesh was but a figure, which thing I never said, nor published, and so thy query is grounded upon a lye : But those that did say and publish that falshood of me, was thy brethren the hirelings, and deceivers at *Newcastle upon Tyne*, and so thou takes their lies to be a strength unto thy own. And as for the believing *Samaritans*, they did know by the spirit of truth that *Jesus of Nazareth*, as then come in the flesh, was indeed the Saviour of the world ; and *Paul* was a true Apostle, when he proved that *Jesus* was the very Christ, as *Acts* 9.

22. And that which Christ himselfe said, in the first of *John* 4. and 2. was true; but what is all that unto thee, to ground thy lye upon, as above mentioned?

Ans. As for thy second query, calling *George Whitehead* a silly deceiver, for justifying of my saying, in his answer to *Cambridge* queries; What *G. Whitehead* said in that answer to *Cambridge* Queries was truth, and was a question put forth unto them, which neither they, nor thou, hast answered, which Query was this: Could Christ have been said to have been transfigured, if his coming in the flesh had not been a figure, or example till his glory was revealed? & hast thou not read that he was the expresse figure of his Fathers substance, instead of which it is translated, he is the expresse image? &c. And if thou wilt prove him a deceiver, first, deny what he hath said, or that it is so written, which if thou do affirme, thou goest but about to turne the truth of God into a lye, and if thou do confesse, thou ownes what *G. Whitehead* hath said, and so not prove him a deceiver; and as for thy reason to contradict it, which is that the Apostles and believers were but forms of godly men, because transformed in the renewing of their minds, *Rom.* 12. 2. In this thou hast appeared very ignorant, void of reason and true comparison; for the Apostles and believers were neither in the power nor form of godly men before the renewing of their minds, but were children of wrath, and were in the form and power of wicked men.

Ans. Again, Thy third Query is grounded upon the same lye with the first, if Christs coming in the flesh be but a figure, which was never spoken by me, nor any of us, but if we should say that Christ was an example, or was the expresse figure of the Fathers substance, yet thereby we do not say, that Christs coming in the flesh is but a figure.

And as for my belief of Jesus, he was real man, and had a real body prepared for him, and in it both soul and spirit, power and life, which was immortal and Eternal, in which body was real flesh and blood, and was born of the Virgine according to the Scripture.

Ans. As to the fourth Query, that which thou queriest of me, thou dost not believe thy selfe, that Christ in that very body of flesh and blood and bone in which he suffered did arise again, but thou saist, with flesh and bone without blood he is in heaven; so then, nor with that real and very body born of the Virgine, which thou saist is real flesh and blood, and so according to thy own writings, not the same: But we do believe, that in the very same real body in which he after his resurrection did converse with his Disciples, is ascended into heaven.

Ans. To thy fifth Query I say, That the suffering and dying of that man Jesus, and his ascending into heaven, is truly available unto those which do receive him; by which their sins are taken away, and they saved from destruction, but those that do not receive him, but reject him, his light and spirit, his suffering, dying and rising again, and ascending, is not available to the taking away, or procuring pardon for their sins, for by their rejection of him, to teach and lead them

them into all truth, they make his blood and all his works, unto them as of none effect.

To thy sixth Query, wherein thou asks whether I do believe there are any Angels or created spirits distinct from men, and from what is in man, and other visible creatures.

Ans. Whether wouldest thou have any to believe above what is written, or where dost thou read, that there is any created Angels or created spirits distinct from God, which is in man, and from all other visible creatures, if thou canst shew me any such Angel or created spirit which is distinct, both from him which did create it, and from all other things created, then thou shewest some ground for such a faith, but the Scripture is not a rule for any such faith, neither doth it speak any such thing, and herein thou wouldest appear wise (or manifest thy self a fool) above what is written, and not as one that would be instructed, though thou be ignorant.

Ans. To the seventh Query, That which shall rise again after death out of the graves, is the Seeds, and each Seed with its own body, for there are two seeds, and two bodies, which shall arise, the one into Everlasting life, the other into condemnation.

Ans. To the eighth Query, The Souls of the wicked at death go to a Hell where torment is felt, which is the eternal wrath of God, the just recompence of reward to all hypocrites hirelings and deceivers, who have not only refused to receive the truth in the love of it, but have also set themselves in enmity against it, and this shalt thou also know hereafter better than thou dost now, and here is an answer returned unto thee without railing according to (1 Pet. 3. 15.)

Richard Hubbertborne.

The Reply to Richard Hubbertornes Answer.

THough there is no end of controversing with evil spirits, nor the answers sent by *R. Hubbertborne* need no Reply, the very comparing them with the questions they relate to, being a sufficient discovery of *Richards* erroneousness in them, to those that are intelligent, yet for the sakes of some weaker ones, and to stop the mouths of the deceived, I shall note his falshoods and deceits therein. 1. His falshoods: as,

1. It's false, That I had in my paper a Preface of lies. My Preface was thus, *Richard Hubbertborne*, I once received a letter from thee, and I gave thee an answer to it, in which I noted thee guilty of 7 or 8 falshoods, thou didst return me an answer to it, but didst neither therein confesse thy evils nor disprove them, so that I might slight thee as a proved lyer. In that answer I remember I took notice of some corrupt passages about the Resurrection of Christ, by which I am satisfied in part that thou art out of the truth; yet because thou shouldest not think, nor thy party vapor (as one of them yester night began to suggest

suggest) that I am afraid to answer thee. ~~Thou~~ Thou having not multiplied thy questions to very many, I shall be willing for this once to returne thee an answer to them, provided that thou wilt plainly and nakedly answer me in the like number propounded by me, to thee; and when thou sendest thy answers to them, to me, thou shalt God willing have mine, to thine, returned by me; this was what he calls my preface, of the truth of which in every particular, I call God to witnesse between us.

2. It's false, that it's my usual and accustomed manner, and the marke of the beast in all my papers to make prefaces of lies, a thing said of him without proof.

3. It's false, that I said he is guilty of 7 or 8 fallhoods, for my words were not so, but that in his former letter (which was some years since sent me) I noted him guilty of 7 or 8 fallhoods, that he is guilty now of them, and repented none of them since, I affirmed not.

4. It's false that his paper proves to the contrary, for neither is his paper in being, and so now proves nothing, nor did it, when in being, take notice of those fallhoods that I charged him with, so as to disprove them.

5. It's false, that I brought as a reason to contradict *G. Whitehead's* indeavoured proof, that the Apostles and believers were but forms of godly men, because transformed in the renewing of their minds, *Rom. 12.* 2. for that was not my reason, nor my assertion, but my saying was, by way of question. Might it not as well by the same reason, be avouched, that the Apostles were but formes of men or of Godly men, because transformed into the renewing of their minds,

6. It's false, that in that saying of mine I appeared very ignorant, void of reason & true comparison, for I appeal to all intelligent men, whether the word transformed, applyed to the believers, signifies not every jot as much, that they were before, or then also, but forms, as that the word transfigured, applyed to Christ, proves that he was, or his coming in the flesh, a figure, or but a figure; Besides, that he left out part of my saying, for I said, forms of men or of godly men.

7. False it is too, that the Apostles or believers, before that transforming of them in the renewing of their minds, mentioned and exhorted to, were neither in the forme nor power of godly men, but were children of wrath and in the power and form of wicked men, for when the *Romans* were exhorted to be transformed in the renewing of their minds (which as it was a thing but exhorted to, they had not as then; for exhortations respect things, things yet to be done when such exhortations are given) they, those *Romans*, were believers and Saints and in part renewed, as appears in *Rom. 1. 7, 8, 12.*

8. It's a grosse fallhood, that he saies in his answer to *Qu. 4.* that I do not believe myself, what I query therein of him: and as,

9. False too that he charges me with querying, whether Christ in that very body of flesh blood and bone, in which he suffered, did arise again.

My

My words were not so, but whether in a real and very body of flesh he dyed, and rose in the same real and very body the third day.

10. False it is again that he saies, I say with flesh and bone without blood he is in heaven, for I have no such saying, nor have so determined of it.

11. False it is too, that he in his next words implies, that if he be not in heaven with flesh blood and bones, then not with that real and very body born of the Virgine, for he was laid into the Sepulchre in that very body born of the Virgin, and not with another, when as yet his blood was before shed out of that body: the body and blood are spoken of as distinct things, and his body, was his body, and the same body in which the blood was, while alive, when in the Sepulchre the blood was not in it; and so the same body may be in heaven, and is, that was born of the Virgine, though it have not all the same things in it that it had when born, as not the same weakness, littleness, mortality, the same body that was peirced with a spear, the issuing out of it's blood was after it's blood was out laid in the Sepulchre, and the same ~~it~~ was laid in the Sepulchre, arose and ascended, though not in the same condition, for it had no life in it, when it was laid in, it had when it arose and ascended; yet dead and living the body was the same.

12. False it is too that I said, his body born of the Virgin is real flesh and blood, I had no such expressions; my expression was, that his body born of the Virgin had in it real flesh and blood, not ~~is~~ (now at present) flesh and blood.

13. False it is, that they (the *Quakers*) do believe, that in the very same real body in which he after his resurrection did converse with his Disciples, is ascended into heaven; for both his eighth question implies that they believe, that what is said about the resurrection of that body is a mystery, otherwise to be understood than as it's recorded: And *G. Fox* & the *Whiteheads*, in their answers to us, grant no other body in heaven but the body the Church, and that is not the body of Christ, in which he after his resurrection conversed with his Disciples, for his Disciples were the body, the Church, or of it, and not the body dead and raised in which he conversed with them. Had he said, they do believe that in such a body, as they imagine him to be raised in, they also believe he is ascended into heaven, it might have gone for a truth, as touching their belief; but that they believe, that in that body (even of flesh and bones, that personal body) in which he conversed with his Disciples after the resurrection, he is ascended into heaven, is too broadly contradictory to their other writings to be true.

14. False it is, that by my own writings it is not the same body that was born of the Virgin, or that dyed, or that is ascended; for I never writ that it was, or is not the same substance or body, though not in the same condition; or have not all the same things in it it had when it was born, or dyed.

15. False it is, that he suggests of me in answer to Quer. 6. as if I had implied

implied such a faith as to believe, that there is any Angel or created spirit which is distinct both from him which did create it, and from all other things created, if by other, he means other from God who created it, otherwise it's false that the Scripture is not a rule for such a faith, as saies, that there is some Angel distinct from God that made it, and from all other things created besides it, for the Scripture is grounded for such a faith as that there is and was an Angel called *Gabriel* sent from God, and so distinct from God who created it, as he did all things, and distinct from all other creatures, so as *Gabriel* was none of the other creatures, nor any other creature was that Angel *Gabriel*, see *Dan.* 9. 21. *Luke* 1. 26.

16. False it is then, that in that 6th. Query, I would appear wise or manifest my self a fool above what is written, &c.

17. His answer to the 7th. query, about what shall rise is altogether corrupt and false, when he saies it's the seeds shall rise; whereas the Scripture saith the men shall rise, every man in his own order, *1 Cor.* 15. 23.

18. It's false, that here is an answer returned without railing according to *1 Pet.* 3. 15. for he neither balked reviling or railing language in his beginning, nor in his proceedings, nor in his end, as the answer it self may witness, nor did he render a reason of the hope that is in him, as *1 Pet.* 3. 15. but in his answer to query 5th. leaves that part of the query unanswered that required a reason of his hope, nor is it at all with meekness and fear or reverence, as the Reader may well perceive. Thus for his falsehoods, a sufficient number in so short an answer, besides what else might have been noted.

2. His defects in his answers are many too, for besides what may be said to his denial of ever saying that Christs coming in the flesh was but a figure, and charging it upon some about *Newcastle*, as if raised falsely upon him, by them, and that I strengthened my self by their lies, which I might have noted as another falsehood, for I never read that I know, of any of their bookes, but found it charged upon him by the Author of the *Cambridge* queries, and not denied, but pleaded for by *G. W.* in his answer to them, and I took it as a sufficient evidence of his being guilty of it, that his brother *G.* undertaking to answer that charge, did not deny it, but endeavoured to make it good, though but sordily, as also his answer to that second query shewes; besides that, I say--

1. His answer to the second query is defective and foolish, for,

1. It's silly, that he saies, what *George Whitehead* said was truth, and yet adds it was a question. Sure if it was a question, it asserted nothing, and so was neither in it self truth nor falsehood; and if it was an intimate assertion by way of question, then it was more then a question simply, and so it was a falsehood, because what was therein intimately asserted, was that Christ being transfigured proved his coming in the flesh a figure, or but a figure, which is no more true, then, that the believers being transformed proves them to have been formes, or but formes, in that part of his answer there was silliness or falsehood. To the question I say by way of answer, Christ might have been said to have been transfigured because the form or figure of his countenance was changed, though his coming in the flesh was no figure, or though it had been no example till his glory was revealed, besides there is this silliness in *G's* answer by the question, that it implies that

Christ was no example for us after he was transfigured, in that he saies, till his glory was revealed, namely, in the transfiguration, which is contrary to 1. Pet. 2. 21. which tells us he was an example in his sufferings, which were after he was transfigured.

2. His saying, hast thou not read, that he was the expresse figure of his Fathers substance, instead of which, it is translated, the expresse image? &c. is but simple, for if it be translated the expresse image, how or where should I read it the expresse figure? not in the *Greek*, for there it is not figure which is an *English* word, nor is it such a *Greek* word as is in any other place of the Bible translated figure, and why is it translated image instead of figure, if the word there used, is none of those words elsewhere in the Scriptures translated by the word figure? besides that, he corrupts the text, and saies the figure of his substance, instead of the image of his person, but what if it had been read, the expresse figure of his Fathers substance? doth that prove his coming was a figure too? so then to prove him a Deceiver, I have denied, and do deny what he saies to be true, if in his question he imply affirmatively, either that those words be so read, or that they prove *Richards* saying that he defends; the falseness of what he adds, to what he calls my reason is before spoken to.

2. His answer to my third question prevaricates, for *Rich. Hubbert* born by *G. Whiteheads* pleading for his saying, said more than he supposes that Christ was an example, or the expresse figure of the Fathers substance, but what is it all one to be an example, and the expresse figure of the Fathers substance that they are put so together, as if they amounted to the same thing? are all examples then in the Scripture the expresse figure of the Fathers substance? but besides that, he in answering leaves out, and durst not touch the terms of my question; as that Jesus was a real man consisting of a real humane body and Soul, and that he was really conceived and born in the natural womb of a corporal Virgin, in such sense a Virgin, as other Virgins be, &c. he durst not speak so distinctly, but hides himself in such general terms as might keep him from being so easily seen.

3. He gives the go-by to the fourth question too, and plaies the prevaricator in the last clauses of it, as is before sufficiently noted

4. He hides himself in his answer to the 5th. and leaves out the latter part of it, for in the former part the word, by which their sins are taken away, those words (by which) are equivocal, and are so subtilly placed as he may mean, that by their receiving him, their sins are taken away and not by the suffering and dying of the man Jesus, &c.

5. In his answer to the sixth, he plainly enough casts mists before his readers eyes, to daze him, that he might not discern, that he believes no Angels or created spirits distinct from God and the spirits of men, and that are in other visible creatures, and yet his intimate joyning with the *Sadduces* in denying them, appears clearly enough, to those whose eyes can see through his mists; for he implies, it's to believe above what is written, to believe that there are Angels or created spirits distinct from men, and what is in man, and in other visible creatures: and by his question, where I read, that there is any created Angels or created spirits distinct from God, which is in man and from all other visible creatures; what doth he, but imply his unbelief

or denial of any such thing? To answer briefly to the question, I say, that though I do not read in just so many words put together that saying, yet I find it clearly in the Scriptures in every part of it, as to say, 1. That there are Angels and Spirits, I read in *Heb.* 1. 7. 14. that they are created, is also both there implied, and in *Ephe.* 3. 9. where it is said that God created all things by Jesus Christ, and in *Col.* 1. 16. all things were created by him that are in heaven, and that are in earth, whether visible and invisible, &c. so then there being such things as Angels and Spirits, & those Angels things in heaven, *Mark* 13. 32. Angels in heaven, and all things in heaven and earth being created of God by Christ, it necessarily follows, that they be creatures and created also. 3. That they are distinct from God; whether as in man, or in heaven, as more usually he is said to be, is as evident if we first shew what it is to be distinct; now that is distinct from another thing that is not that thing, as the Soul is distinct from the body, because it is not the body, and the body is distinct from the Soul, because it is not the Soul, and the eye is distinct from the sight, because the eye may be without sight, and the servant is distinct from the master, because he is not the master, so the Angels are distinct from God and Christ, because they are not God nor Christ, but created by God and Christ, and made ministering spirits, and sent forth from God to such purpose, and that they are distinct from all other visible creatures, is evident because they are not any of the other creatures visible or invisible, but are a distinct kind of creature themselves, distinctly named from them, and that have distinctly some of them appeared, when made visible to the sight of men, without the bodies and beings of all other creatures, as in those that ministered to Christ, and that appeared to *Daniel*, to *Peter*, to *Paul*, to *Cornelius* and divers others, which were neither properly men, nor women, nor any other creature distinct from Angels or ministering spirits; &c. So that that question implies great ignorance and unbelief of the Scriptures, as also his adding that, if I can shew him any such Angel or created spirit, that is distinct both from him which did create it, and from all other things created, then I shew some ground for such a faith, this with his changing my words which were distinct from men, & from what is in man & in other visible creatures, into another form, viz. distinct from him that made them, and from all other creatures implies that he thinks there is no creature but what is visible or may be seen, sure his other senses may confute such a fancy, for did he ever see any mans Soul? or see the wind that blows? and yet I trow these be creatures, but why will he not believe more then I can shew him? Angels be of themselves invisible, pitch their tents about men, who yet see them not, as *Psa.* 34. 7. with *2 Kin.* 6. 16, 17. but I have shewed him in the Scripture, if he have any eyes of understanding to see with; that there was, and truly is an Angel *Gabriel* sent of God, and not God himself, who is distinct from all other men, Angels and creatures besides him, they none of them being him; yea many thousand such shall Christ appear with at his coming, as in *Mat.* 16. 27. *2 Thess.* 1. 7. so that his falshood and impiety appears in what follows in the answer as that the Scripture is not a rule for any such faith, nor doth speak any such thing.

6. And his Answer to the 7th. Query joyned with his former answer

proves him a *sharp* Sadducee to them that can understand him, for as his answer to the 1st. denies intimately, and yet plainly enough, that there be any such Angels and Spirits as the Scripture declares, so his answer to the 2^d. denies the resurrection of the body, as will appear if he will clearly speak out his mind in explication of his said answer, for to that query, what it is of men that shall rise again after the bodily death? he answers, That which shall rise again after death out of the grave, is the seeds and each seed with its own body, for there are two seeds and two bodies which shall arise, the one into everlasting life, and the other into condemnation, which though it be the most positive answer of any he gives, & freest from reviling language, yet cannot be understood unless it be known, what be those two seeds? whether they be not the wheat and the Tares spoken of *Mat. 13. 37, 38*? or what else they be? and who sows, or sowed them? and when? and where they be sown? and what be the graves they be in? and whether they be but two seeds in all the world over, or two in every man, one the incorruptible seed, the other the corruptible seed? and whether they be sown or raised after the bodily death of men, or only after some spiritual death of the seeds? for I named after the bodily death, and he leaves out the word bodily, and so speaks equivocally: and whether be each of these seeds a man, seeing the Apostle saies not every seed, but every man shall rise in his own order? and whether did the Apostle forget one of those seeds, when he saies, it is sown in weaknesse, it is raised in power, when of two he should have said, they are sown in weaknesse they are raised in power? and whether is either of these seeds, when its sown a natural body, and either of them when they rise a spiritual body, seeing the Apostle saies it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body? and what be the two bodies they shall rise with? are they two in every man? or be they humane bodies, or bodies of men? and why saies he the one into everlasting life, the other into condemnation? and why not unto everlasting life and unto condemnation? and why is not the condemnation said to be everlasting by him as well as the life? Those things I challenge him for explaining his answer before it can be seen to agree with the Apostles Doctrine of the Resurrection.

7. For the eighth query, he in his answer leaves out the word Bodily again, and so tells us not of any hell men go into, or their souls, after the death of their bodies; but prevaricates and hides himself again: nor proves that eternal wrath shall give up any that shall be in it, as it is said hell and Death shall, *Rev. 20. 13*.

But if Hell be the reward of all Lyers, Deceivers, Hirelings and Hypocrites, what will become of *Richard Hubberborne*, who hath told so many falsehoods, and delt so deceitfully and hypocritically in those his answers; if he repent not, let the Reader judge.

John Horne.

F. I. N. I. S.